

Dr. Baith

NOTES
ON
ROMANS
16:17.18

H.W. ROMOSER

The Central Regional Pastoral Conference of the Northern Illinois District, meeting February 3-4, 1948, adopted this paper without dissenting vote and resolved to make it available to the members of the conference. "It was also moved that with the permission of the officers of the conference any individual or group be permitted to have this paper published if such opportunity is available."

Parakaloo de humas, adelphoi, skopein tous tas dichostasias kai ta skandala para teen didacheen heen humeis emathete poiountas, kai ekklinete ap autoon;

Hoi gar toioutoi too kurioo heemon Christoo ou douleuousin alla tee heautoon koilia, kai dia tees chreestologias kai eulogias exapatoosin tas kardias toon akakoon.

Now I beseech you, brethren mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

- - -

A word of explanation is necessary. Last Fall the Conference assigned a review of the Presidency's Theses on Fellowship to me. Within the past two weeks President Behnken made the announcement that the first set of theses to be issued will deal with "The Church," to be followed thereafter by theses on fellowship. At the same time, on the basis of the reaffirmation of the Brief Statement by the 1947 convention, he stated that the theses to be issued will, of course, not depart from the declared position of Synod. He pointed out that we study doctrines constantly in order to strengthen ourselves in the conviction we hold and pointed to the propriety of continuous study of our official position. Since Romans 16:17 is cited on fellowship both in our synodical Constitution and in the Brief Statement, and with the thought that the Conference would wish to study material related to the subject originally assigned for these hours, I have prepared notes on Romans 16:17-18 for consideration today.

To offer a discussion of this passage is not to suggest that it is unclear or that it requires extensive exegesis. These notes are presented, rather, in the sense of Dr. Pieper's words in his Christliche Dogmatik: "The entire Christian doctrine lies revealed in such passages as are equally accessible to the learned and the unlearned, and therefore require no exegesis in the sense of clarification of obscurities" I,434. See also 435. "This fact is the basis of all exegetical activity" I,434. "All exegesis must be tested by the clearer light of Scripture" I,436. The function of Scriptural exegesis when dealing with clear passages is not to offer exposition of what is self-evident from the text, but to ward off false interpretations and thus "lead the fickle human spirit back to the bare Scripture without exegesis" I,436.

We shall first consider the vocabulary and syntax of the two verses, then look at what we may call a "catalog of testimonies," and finally draw the necessary conclusions.

I

No question is raised with regard to the parakaloo which introduces verse 17. It means to "admonish, beg, entreat, exhort, beseech." "I beseech" you is entirely adequate.

The conjunctive particle de which follows was originally an adverb, carrying a sense of "on the other hand, on the contrary." It is weaker than alla, stronger than kai in the conjunctive use. In his Greek Grammar for Colleges Herbert Weir Smyth, sec. 2834-6, calls it "adversative and copulative." The word marks a transition to something new, to be distinguished from what has preceded, in this case vv. 1-16. The sequence of the chapter is this: Greetings are extended to individuals in the first fifteen verses. V. 16 presents a summary: "Salute one another with a holy kiss. The churches of Christ salute you." These people are brethren and sisters in the faith. They are to show it through friendly, loving conduct toward one another. But the apostle is constrained to speak also of those who make trouble,

divisions, offenses in the church. He introduces the material of v. 17. These disturbers may come at any time; they also will want the holy kiss, will wish to be received as brethren; but "Don't kiss these." Thus H. E. Jacobs in the Lutheran Commentary on Romans at this place writes: "The unity of the church presented in the greetings suggests the hindrances that mar it elsewhere; and this leads to the considerations that threaten the future, near or remote, of every church, however harmonious and prosperous."

No question is raised with regard to humas adelphoi. This was a precept given to the Christians in Rome; it is a direction for us, for the precepts and promises of Scripture, unless specifically abrogated by God, apply to all ages. E.g., Matt. 5:13: "Ye are the light of the world;" John 20:22: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins, etc.;" all commandments; Matt. 28:20: "Lo, I am with you alway." In our approach also to this passage we shall do well to remember the words of Stalker in his Trial and Death of Jesus Christ, p.273: "The Bible is a book for every generation; and the deduction of the message which it is intended to convey to the present day is as truly the task of the interpreter. There is a species of exegesis, sometimes arrogating to itself the sole title to be considered scientific, by which the garden of Scripture is transmuted into an herbarium of withered specimens."

No difficulty occurs with regard to skopein. The verb has its root in skopee, "an outlook place, a watchtower," and skopia, "a lookout place." The Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon gives its meaning as "1) to look at or after a thing; 2) metaph.: to look to, consider, examine, take heed." Thayer remarks in the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: "Skopein is more pointed than blepein; often equivalent to scrutinize, observe. When the physical sense recedes, equivalent to fix one's (mind's) eye on, direct one's attention to anything in order to get it, or owing to an interest in it, or a duty towards it." "Mark, be on the lookout for" is the sense here, inculcating a constant watchfulness against danger at any time from any direction.

It is to be noted that we are dealing here with a word used in a derived sense - without objection from anyone as to the translation. Cf. also ekklinete. More will be said of this later.

On the infinitive form here Smyth remarks, op. cit., 2013: "The infinitive may be used for the second person of the imperative....This infinitive is commoner in poetry than in prose (where it has a solemn or formal force)." and adds, "This infinitive may be used in conjunction with an imperative," as occurs here.

Ekklinete is used three times in the New Testament: 1 Pet.3:11, "Let him eschew evil;" Rom. 3:12, "They are all gone out of the way;" and here, "Avoid them." L. & S. defines this use: "To turn away apo tinou," from someone.

The scope of the direction is fixed by the context. Throughout this chapter St. Paul has been dealing with religious fellowship, fellowship in the church.-not all intercourse. His prohibition does not cover the latter; that would be a command impossible to execute, as Dr. Pieper pointed out in his 1924 essay on Unionism, referring to 1 Cor. 5 "where the apostle says that the Christians would have to leave the world entirely if they did not want to associate in any manner whatsoever with their fellowmen. According to God's own order Christians should rather be shining lights in this world." To urge the absolute application of ekklinete would make mission work on the advocates of error, Christian or non-Christian, an impossibility, would forbid us to hear any word spoken or to read any word written by a scoffer, would perhaps keep us off all busses and trains, out of all stores, and the like.

The usage of tous poiountas here is regular. Says Smyth, sec. 1153: "The article has the power to make substantival any word or words to which it is prefixed. ...b. Participles (with indefinite force): ho boulomenos, whoever wills." Sec.1124:

"A participle with the article may denote an entire class: ho boulomenos, any one who wishes... ho logopoiontes, newsmongers, D. 4,49.... The same sense is expressed by pas ho with a participle or adjective." His comment in sec. 1123 is also of interest: "In the singular the generic article makes a single object the representative of the entire class; in the plural it denotes all the objects belonging to a class. The generic article is especially common in the plural, with adjectives used substantively: ouk an tis eipoi hoos tous kakourgous kai adikous eia katagelan, no one could say that he permitted the malefactor and the wrongdoer to deride him."

The verb means (L. & S.) "to make, produce, create.... II. of abstract things, to bring to pass, bring about, cause." The use of the participle, here in the present, to indicate the stage of action is familiar. Poiontas is the object of skochein and ekklinete: "Mark, avoid those who make." There is, of course, nothing in the text to justify the translation "seek to make." We note also that the participle is masculine, not neuter, referring to people. Surely, the injunction is directed also against false doctrine; but the Holy Spirit speaking through St. Paul knew better than to use the masculine when He intended the neuter, that is, did not say "errorists" when He meant only to refer to error.

We shall withhold discussion of the articles tas and ta attached to dichostasias and skandala for a few moments. Dichostasia is translated as "divisions" here and in 1 Cor. 3:3 (where the margin is "factions"), and as "seditions" in Gal. 5:20. It does not occur otherwise in the New Testament. The word derives from the adverb dicha, meaning "in two, asunder, apart," and steenai, "to stand." The verb dichostateo means to "stand apart, disagree." The noun, then, signifies "a standing apart, division, faction, dissension, sedition."

Skandalon here corresponds to the skandaleethron of classical usage. Originally it meant a "stick in a trap (on which bait is placed)." L. & S. defines it as "a trap or snare laid for an enemy. Metaphorically: a stumbling block, offense, scandal." In the New Testament it is variously translated as "occasion of stumbling (margin: scandal), occasion to fall, offense, stumbling block, thing that offendeth (margin: scandal)." It designates any person or thing by which one is entrapped, caused to fall, drawn into sin and error. The verbal background of the word should be borne in mind; skandalidzo occurs 29 times in the N. T. We note with regard to this word also that it is used here in a derived sense.

Para has the root sense of "beside, alongside of." L. & S. defines its use: "C. with acc. - 4c. contrary to, against. Para to dikaion, Thuc. 5,90; para tas spomas, tous nomous, Thuc. 1,67, etc." We read in Thayer: "III. 2. beside, beyond, that is, metaphorically a. equivalent to 'contrary to'; para teen didacheen, Rom. 16,17." We may add another note from L. & S.: "C. with Acc. it properly denotes a coming to the side of an object or motion alongside it." This is of interest in connection with the sense of continuing advocacy of error which makes a person a division-maker.

Didachee in the N. T. means "teaching," either the act of teaching or, much more frequently and commonly, "the material taught." It refers to what the Romans, in this instance, had learned from the apostolic teaching activity, e.g., on God, sin, the person of Christ, justification, election, sanctification, means of grace, law and gospel, Christian love (Hoerber, A Grammatical Study of Romans 16,17, pp. 29-30). Extended comment on this usage in the passage before us is unnecessary since it is agreed also by the author of the essay on these verses in Speaking the Truth in Love and his collaborators that the whole body of doctrine is meant (Report of President's Committee on A Statement, p. 8, sec. 4a: "Both parties held that didachee means the entire corpus of doctrine, every doctrine taught by Christ and the Apostles." Also, p. 4, sec. 4c, quoting Speaking the Truth: "Which teaching? The whole body of Christian doctrine? Probably." Footnote: Changed to 'certainly' in the November [12-15, 1946] meeting [of the 10 and 10] by the author."). This being granted, that didachee is here used in the plain sense in which it appears throughout

the N. T. unless restricted by a modifier, it is not permissible to shrink the term to mean a single doctrine of the corpus, since there is no justification in the context for assuming such a synecdoche.

The article teen attached to didacheen does indeed 'point to something coming.' That "something" is given in the clause which immediately follows: heen emathete, "which you have learned." In A Grammatical Study of Romans 16, 17 Dr. R. G. Hoerber concisely remarks, p.30: "The specific article teen does not limit the noun didacheen to any single doctrine of systematized dogmatics; it merely connects the noun with the relative clause heen humeis emathete. The context limits the noun only by the clause, 'which you learned.' Did the Christians at Rome learn only the doctrine of law and gospel, or only the doctrine of Christian love, or only the doctrine of justification? Or were they instructed in all the teaching of the apostles and prophets? To whom would St. Paul apply these words? Would he wish the Christians at Rome to avoid only those people who insisted on circumcision and to join with those who denied the resurrection of Christ? Would Paul be pleased if the Christians at Rome shunned only the quarrelsome individuals and extended the hand of fellowship to those who denied that Jesus was the Son of God? The answers to these questions are obvious. The confusion arises when an attempt is made to interpret a specific article as implying only one single phase of St. Paul's teaching or only one single doctrine as catalogued in systematized dogmatics. The specific use of the definite article, as observed previously, can infer 'the well-known' only when the context gives such permission. In Romans 16,17 the only limitation in the context to the phrase teen didacheen is the relative clause 'which you learned.'" Further, we note the striking parallel of this phrase, "the doctrine which ye have learned," with Paul's words in 6:17: "Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you," hupeekousate de ek kardias eis hon paradotheete tupon didachees."

To which part of the sentence is "the doctrine which ye have learned" attached? Shall we translate: "Those who make divisions and offenses which are against the doctrine you have learned" (the adjectival construction, para teen didacheen describing the divisions and offenses) or shall we translate: "Those who, contrary to the doctrine you have learned that there should be peace always, make divisions and offenses" (the adverbial construction, para teen didacheen modifying poiountas. If this be correct, we are commanded to avoid only those who, for any reason, disturb the peace.)? Some have argued that the latter construction, the adverbial is "normal use." That has been thoroughly answered by Dr. Hoerber with examples from both classical and N. T. sources (op. cit., pp.5-10). The argument has been made that the absence of a relative article before para teen didacheen throws the phrase toward poiountas. That is also answered in the examples cited by Hoerber. Also, it is to be noted that such scholars as Phillipi, Hodge, Stoeckhardt, Thayer, Kittel, Ebeling, Robertson-Davis, Expositor's Greek Testament take the para phrase as an adjunct of the "divisions and offenses." Even Dr. Hamann, who espouses the adverbial construction, states that none of the authorities he consulted accept that construction. That the absence of the relative article before para is in no way decisive is indicated, for instance, by A. T. Robertson in his Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 784: "Phrases that are consciously verbal in origin" (cf. skandalon, skandalidzoo) "readily do without the repeated article." Again, commenting on the omission of such an article, he writes on p. 783: "It is much simpler and truer to say that the need of another article was not felt." Recall again Hoerber's remarks on teen didacheen. We therefore set aside the adverbial construction because of the denotation of didachee, the force of the articles before dichostasias and skandala, which point to the para phrase following, and the common understanding of the phrase as defining what sort of dichostasias and skandala are meant. Let us hear A. T. Robertson construe this verse in A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament, 1933, pp.200-201: "The verb (predicate) has two accusatives (humas, skopein). This infinitive skopein has an object, the articular participle tous poiountas. This participle poiountas has two substantives as object and one prepositional adjunct, para teen didacheen. The substantive didacheen is further described by the relative

clause heen humeis emathete. It is all beautifully linked together in a perfectly transparent way radiating from the predicate verb parakalbo (the infinitive to the predicate, the participle to the infinitive, the substantives to the participle, the adjunct to the substantives, the relative clause to the adjunct."

We must remark further that if we accept the adverbial construction, i.e., "those who,, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned not to make divisions, do make divisions, etc.," that would teach us that all divisions are forbidden and sinful. What right, then did the apostles have to leave the synagogue? Was Gerhard wrong when he exulted over Luther's work, "O seliges Schisma!""? Are Luther and the Saxons condemned by these verses? What shall we do with 1 Tim. 6:3-5, "From such withdraw thyself," with Titus 3:10, "An heretic reject," with 2 Cor. 6:17, "Come out from among them"? What of Jesus' words in Luke 12:51?

We turn to the articles tas and ta attached to dichostasias and skandala. It is necessary to keep the terminology clear in dealing with the articles; there has been much confusion here. There is, of course, no indefinite article, "a, an," in Greek. All articles are definite, dividing into specific or particular and generic articles. Smyth, 1122: "The generic article denotes an entire class as distinguished from other classes." 1119: "The particular article denotes individual persons or things as distinguished from others of the same kind." The confusion in this matter, as evidenced by a varying use of the term "definite" in Speaking the Truth, p.40, has been pointed out by Hoerber, p. 27.

Let us note in passing that while Zahn translates these articles in reproducing the text, he does not italicize them, as has been done in quoting him. Also, if Zahn is to be cited as inserting the articles, we may note that in his commentary on Romans Brunner does not translate them.

There has been discussion whether these articles are generic or specific. Let us accept the proposition that they are specific. That does not mean, however, that they produce the meaning "the well-known divisions and offenses." The article means just what it says: THE. True, there is an anaphoric use of the specific article, involving, e.g., reference to something already mentioned or present to the mind or senses, but the context, written or social, must clearly indicate what it is. If the context does not make the reference clear and unmistakable, we may not assume an anaphoric use of the article. As Hoerber writes, p. 25, "The context alone can give the added connotation of 'the well-known.'" There is no such immediate or remote contextual identification in Romans. Consider the absurdity of it if we were to translate all specific articles with "the well-known" after the fashion of "the well-known divisions and offenses"!

Allow me to repeat. The specific article does not in itself identify.. All it does is to serve notice on the reader that the writer has in mind a particular thing and bid the reader prepare to notice the identifying mark. This identifying mark will lie either in the context or in the modifying phrase, or be available from certain particular circumstances. Evidence for this fact is supplied also by this text itself, for Paul is not satisfied to identify the doctrine he referred to in the text with the bare article, teen didacheen, but adds the identifying mark, heen emathete. We recall that Luther found it impossible to identify from the passage Rom. 1:17, ho dikaios ek piseos zeasetai, who was meant by ho dikaios just because the article was used; and that fact nearly drove him to despair. The identification of dikaos had to be made from the Pauline theology, from the context, not from the article. The context of Rom. 16:17-18 does not furnish an iota of evidence by which the identification could have been made. There is absolutely no proof that the Romans knew definite men or groups to whom Paul was referring as then carrying on their divisive activity. Cf. the commentators and their widely divergent guesses as to the persons or groups referred to - Judaizers? Gnostics? Antinomian libertines?

But the articles do have a function. They indicate that "something is coming up" to define the dichostasias kai skandala. They point to the para phrase. In passing it may be remarked that it is absurd to assert that all articles in a given sentence must be alike, i.e., all generic or all specific. Everyday usage confutes that contention.

We reach the inevitable conclusion, therefore, that the phrases shall be construed as does Robertson: "who cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned," and not as teaching: "Avoid only those who, contrary to the doctrine you have learned that the peace is to be kept, make divisions and offenses." The warning is against any and all who propose doctrine "alongside, contrary to" the teaching of God's Word, the corpus doctrinae.

Per contra, let us assume for a moment that the para clause is attached to poiountas. Then tas dichostasias kai ta skandala stand alone and we are at a loss to find the antecedent explanatory reference. Also, we must deal with the statement of Robertson, p. 794, opposed to the "well-known divisions" theory: "No vital difference was felt between articular and anarthrous nouns (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 259)."

Let us turn now to v. 18. It is introduced by gar, a causal conjunction, for, nam, enim. Smyth, 2810, says: "It serves to introduce a cause of, or a reason for, an action before mentioned; to justify a preceding utterance, to confirm the truth of a previous statement." So also Thayer: "It adduces the cause or gives the reason of a preceding statement or opinion.... 3. To sentences in which something is commanded or forbidden gar annexes the reason why the thing must either be done or avoided." The usage is clear. The conjunction requires us to construe v. 18 as an adverbial clause stating God's reason for the command of v. 17. The verse must be referred to the verbs skopein and ekklinete. It may not be construed as a modifier of tous poiountas; such interpretation would require an adjective modifier. We may not explain v. 18 as a limitation or characterization or description by which we are to recognize and identify tous poiountas. We are not to wait for corroboration from v. 18 to identify the persons mentioned in v. 17. We grant that characteristics of errorists are mentioned in v. 18. We grant that in specific instances God may also unveil such errorists as definitely living in the interest of their old Adam, and that such evidence would corroborate the correctness of the action prescribed in v. 17, ekklinete. But no one has the right to rely on such revelation or to hold the action enjoined in v. 17 in abeyance until such manifestation has been consummated. All the marks necessary for identification are given in v. 17; we are in duty bound to act when these marks are in evidence.

The fact that God passes a judgment which is also a description does not necessarily furnish us men with marks which we can recognize; e.g., Deut 18:10-12: "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through fire ... for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord;" Matt 24:5: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves;" Mark 10:14: "Suffer the little children... for of such is the kingdom of God." Each of these passages contains a characterization. Yet no one would attempt to identify the persons mentioned by the characterization which God makes in giving us the reason for the commands. The method is equally out of place in Rom. 16. The characterization of the poiountas in v. 18 is not serviceable to us for purposes of identification, for we cannot see who really serves Christ, and who pretends to serve Christ but serves his koilia. If it is claimed that v. 18 refers to hypocrites, identification would never be possible since we cannot identify a hypocrite until he has become a manifest sinner. The construction forbids us to translate in the sense "Avoid those... namely, they that serve not." That is not what is written.

The translation of hoi toioutoi as "they that are such" is adequate. Toioutos

corresponds to talis, "of such sort," i.e., those who cause divisions, etc. In this activity, in being such as cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine, they serve not the Lord Jesus Christ.

The poiountas here come into consideration not for their entire life, but only because of and with reference to their creation of divisions and scandals. In fact, nowhere in v. 17 or v. 18 is reference made to their faith or lack of faith. Only their activity is mentioned. Hence the expression ou douleuousin is to be applied to them only so far as the activity mentioned in v. 17 is concerned. In this matter of making divisions and offenses they do not serve Christ. We may note in passing that, indeed, some orthodox teachers may seek their own interests. Cf. Phil.1:15ff.

"They do not serve," ou douleuousin, we read. Note that not diakoneoo, but the very strong douleuoo is used. Adoulos is a slave. Douleuoo is "to be a slave," in a derived sense "to serve or be subject to, to obey." One who is a slave serves his master unquestioningly. He hears the master's command; he exercises no contrary will of his own; he does exactly what he is ordered to do.

A Christian who corresponds to all these points is perfect. Hence if ou douleuousin means "no Christians," there are no Christians in the world, not even St. Paul, who in Rom. 7:25 said that he was divided in his allegiance, serving (douleuoo) Christ according to his spiritual nature, and sin according to his carnal nature. Thus he admits in himself a will contrary to that of God. Thus Luther remarks, IX, 452f: "So, then, the Christian is divided into two parts. In that he is flesh, he is under the Law; in that he is spirit, he is under grace."

The fact that the people of this text are not Christians cannot be deduced from the expression itself, for Christ used even stronger language when He called Peter "Satan." Nor may one argue that strong language is evoked only when fundamental errors are rebuked. All error is rebuked in sternest terms, for, as Paul writes to the Galatians, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," Gal. 5:9. The matter under discussion in Rom. 16 is the Christian doctrine, hence the strong language in v. 18; not nearly so strong as "Satan," however. Hence, if "Satan" does not mean that Christ called Peter no Christian, much less can ou douleuousin be said to deny a person's Christianity.

In considering v. 18 we must bear in mind that here God is declaring His judgment of those who cause and maintain divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine. He states the fact: "They serve not our Lord Jesus Christ." He does not make it our duty to ascertain whether faith is present. The command of v. 17 is to be obeyed, whether or not we can establish the individual's condition as to saving faith - and when is that absolutely possible?

The text gives no authorization to the translation "those who refuse to serve." God here does not refer us to the act of refusal, but states His verdict without describing the cause or manner of the person's action.

The noun koilia derives from the adjective koilos meaning any hollow form. The adjective passes through the noun koilon which L. & S. defines as "a hollow, cavity; esp. like koilia, of the cavities in the body, e.g., of the stomach, the heart, the hands, the foot, the side, the flank." The same lexicon defines koilia as "the large hollow or cavity of the body, the belly...alone...often used for the stomach; and also for the different parts of the whole digestive system... The intestines, bowels...The excrements...any cavity in the body, a ventricle, chamber, as in the lungs, heart, liver, brain...The socket of a bone...Any hollow or cavity in the earth, in the clouds."

In the Septuagint koilia is used to designate the innermost thought-and-emotional life of a person. See, for example, Ps. 22:14; Song of Sol. 5:4; Isa. 16:11; Lam. 1:20; Job 15:35; Prov. 18:20, 27, 30. Some of these passages, if "belly" or

"bowels" is taken in the physical sense, become too shocking to quote here. However, we may illustrate what nonsense develops if a purely physical sense of koilia is insisted upon by these examples: "A man's belly (koilia) shall be satisfied with the fruit of his mouth," Prov. 18:20; "Their belly prepareth deceit," Job 15:35. In the N. T. koilia is used 3 times where the context does not specify something physical (as it does in Matt. 19:12, koilia meetros). The three passages are John 7:38, Rom. 16:18, Phil. 3:19. John and Philipians are clearly metaphorical. It is entirely natural to understand Romans similarly as metaphorical, meaning the innermost thought-and-emotional life. So Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch, 1938 (Behm), says of koilia: "Eigentlich: a) Leibeshoehle. d. Gehirnhoehle. In der Septuaginta - das Innerste...das verborgene Innere des Menschen, die Staette seiner Gedanken und Empfindungen. B. koilia in N. T. l.c. das Innere, John 7:38."

We must note also that to define koilia as "gluttony, sexual appetite" is already to have departed from the literal sense of the word, to be using it in a derived sense. So Moffatt does: "Slaves of their own base desires." So the author of the essay on these verses in Speaking the Truth does not hold to the literal, primary sense when he says, "The disturbers... 2. are self-servers and, perhaps, even gluttonous," or again, "for whom the Gospel ministry is a means of gain, to quote Godet 'and gain the means of satisfying their gross passions.'" Both "gain" and "passions" are clearly derived senses of the word, metaphorical usage; you are not dealing with a literal rendering.

An application: It has been generally conceded in our midst that such a teacher as Fosdick comes under the description and application of this text. Yet it is impossible to identify an errorist like Fosdick, whose social life is above reproach, if the decision depends on anything beside his teaching. That he preaches as he does because he makes money thereby and would preach otherwise if there were no financial inducement cannot be proved. Nor dare one wait to see if he will deceive the simple, because that cannot be determined till the damage has been done.

It will be noted that if koilia is to be understood in the strictly literal sense, we will have to determine not merely whether a man is gluttonous, but whether he actually worships his belly and accords it the reverence and worship due a god.

Dia chreestologias. Dia denotes the means or instrument by which anything is effected, "through, by." Chreestologia is "fair speaking, plausible speech." It is a hapax legomenon in the N. T. L. & S. asserts that the word is used in both good and bad sense (Chrysostom) in ecclesiastical literature.

Eulogia appears 16 times in the N. T., 11 times as "blessing," twice as "bountifully," once as "bounty," once as "matter of bounty." L. & S. defines it as meaning, in an evil sense, "a fair sound, speciousness."

Exapatousin occurs 5 times in the N. T., once as "beguile," four times as "deceive." A compound of apatao, it means to "deceive or beguile thoroughly." Kittel calls attention to one of its senses: "Von suendlichen Selbstbetrug," (emphasis mine) 1 Cor. 3:18; Jas. 1:26." We read in 1 Cor. 3:18; "Let no man deceive himself;" in James 1:26 (simple apatao): "deceiveth his own heart." Certainly a deliberate, sinister, conscious purpose on the part of a man to deceive his own heart does not lie in that usage. We note also that Jesus said that those who would kill His disciples would think that that they "did God service." Cf. also Paul's expressions in Acts 26:9; Phil. 3:6. Did these men with deliberate, sinister purpose against themselves deceive themselves? We may not inject this "deliberate, sinister purpose" motif into the verses before us.

Several practical questions suggest themselves here. How would I determine beyond peradventure of doubt that a person is guilty of actual belly-worship? How shall I determine that a man is a deliberate deceiver, a hypocrite, coming with sinister purpose? Will he tell me his purpose or can I read his heart? What purpose,

then, does the injunction of v. 17, under this interpretation, serve? Again, when it is a question of transferring members to a congregation whose pastor is not known to us, do we first investigate whether he is at heart a worshipper of that organ we call the stomach, whether he is in the ministry with intent to deceive? No, we are governed, of course, by his public confession and teaching as it is expressed in his denominational membership and public activity. One cannot go to California, Maine or Florida to investigate the private life of a pastor there every time a member asks transfer to his church!

Tas kardias, they deceive "the hearts" of the simple. Note the metaphoric use here again. Certainly no one will suggest that "heart" must be understood in the primary, literal sense of "an organ of the body." It refers to the inmost life of the individual, the soul

Toon akakoon are the "simple" and "harmless." Thus the N. T. uses the word in two instances. L. & S. defines it as referring to those who are unknowing of evil, guileless, benignant, innocent, simple. It has a twofold sense: "without evil in self" and "expecting no evil." Further comment seems unnecessary. Let us only add the note: If we wait till we discover "sinister purpose" on the part of the poiountas by seeing their effect on the guileless, the recognition comes to late - PERHAPS FOR US AKAKOI ALSO!

So sum up: Belly-service in false teaching may become apparent and may even take the form of gluttony or of gross sexual indulgence or, on the other hand, may be practised so secretly or be so hidden that only God sees and knows it. God, however, has not ordered us to mark and avoid only after we have established belly-serving as an aim or purpose of the false teaching that has appeared. He has made it our duty to identify the persons we should mark and avoid by their discernible activity, v. 17, the creation of divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine we have learned.

We draw together once more the major grammatical considerations of the verse.
1) Verse 18 may not be construed as a modifier of tous poiountas; 2) It may not be explained as a limitation, characterization, or description by which we are to recognize the poiountas. 3) It must be referred to the verbs skopein and ekklinete. 4) Therefore the warning and command in v. 17 may not be restricted to such false teachers and their adherents as cannot be considered Christians, but refers to all persistent false teachers and those who adhere to them.

God has spoken in these verses and He has spoken clearly. He is in earnest in His Word. 1 Pet. 4:11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Jer. 23:28ff.: "He that hath My word, let him speak My word faithfully, etc." 1 Cor. 1:10: "Now I beseech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." John 8:31f.: "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth." Matt. 28:20: "Teaching them to observe all things." And so the passages are multiplied. God is concerned that His Word be held and taught clearly and fully because of His holy wisdom and because of His infinite love for sinners, because He knows that each single error in teaching His Word is potentially destructive of faith, capable of leading men away from their eternal Savior. He tells us that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," that the word of errorists "doth eat like a cancer." Therefore His earnestness in Rom. 16:17, that hard command, and His stern judgment upon errorists in v. 18.

II

It is proper to consider a "catalog of testimonies." Certainly we shall not put the words of men in the place of the Word of God. Nor, on the other hand, do we wish to act as if all wisdom first came to birth in us. The fathers have things to tell and teach us, Heb. 13:7. Furthermore, we have given our assent to confessions of our church and have declared that a church's position is determined by its confessions, public teaching, and publications.

Let us first consult some of the translations. Luther: "Ich ermahne euch, liebe Brueder, dasz ihr aufsehet auf die, die da Zertrennung und Aergernis anrichten, neben der Lehre, die ihr gelernet habt, und weichet von denselbigen." The Vulgate runs in the same fashion. American Revised Version: "...them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine (teaching which ye learned; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly, and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." Revised Standard Version: "I appeal to you, brethren, to take note of those who create dissensions and difficulties, in opposition to the doctrine which ye have been taught; avoid them. For such persons do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by fair and flattering words they deceive the hearts of the simple minded."

The Lutheran Confessions speak: Smalcald Articles, De. Pot., 41 (Trig. 516): "And Paul commands that false teachers be avoided and execrated as an abomination." This is written concerning the Pope and his adherents (suis membris) - at least some still Christians. The words are repeated in the Formula of Concord, Th. Decl., X, 22 (Trig. 1061). (Obviously, Rom. 16 is referred to; no book, chapter or verse citation appears in the original of either Confession.) The Formula continues: "It is a grave matter that one should separate oneself from so many lands and people, and profess a separate doctrine; but here stands God's command that everyone should beware of and not agree with those who maintain false doctrine or attempt to support it by means of cruelty."

Luther speaks on the passage repeatedly. We sample his remarks. XI, 1118f: "He speaks not about contrary doctrines, but about those that are placed alongside the true doctrine. They are the additions which cause division. That is what St. Paul calls a 'doctrine alongside' (Nebenlehre), an addition; and it is a stumbling block, an offense and by-way, since they would make consciences dependent on the things they advocate. The Gospel, however, is so tender and precious that it can tolerate no addition or human doctrine. The teachings of the priests as to how I shall get to heaven by fasting, praying, and similar works is only such a by-way, which the Gospel will not have; but they want it, therefore they are thieves and murderers; for they tear the conscience away, thereby butchering the sheep and destroying them. How is that done? If merely a by-path is made, then as a result my soul will be torn away from God, then I will perish. That selfsame by-path is therefore my murder and death; for the conscience and heart of man must rely on one single word, otherwise it cannot be preserved; for all flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field,' as saith Isaiah 40:6.

"The doctrines of men, let them be as attractive as they will, do perish and with them the conscience which has built thereon; there is neither help nor counsel. But the word of God is everlasting and must remain eternally, no devil can destroy it; that is the foundation which must be laid for the conscience, upon which it may be established eternally. The words of men and whatsoever depends on them go to ruin. Therefore they who do not enter through this door, that is, do not proclaim the pure, unadulterated Word of God without any addition, do not lay the right foundation; they ruin, kill and murder, and slaughter the sheep."

VIII, 1861: "Those who make divisions and offences. That is directed against all sorts of doctrines of men." XIV, 109 (Foreword to Romans): "The last chapter is a chapter of greetings; but with them he includes an important warning against

men's doctrines which intrude alongside the gospel teaching and cause offense." XIV,1859f: "In short, they [false teachers] contend constantly against the saving Word of God and the pure faith... For all of their teaching tends to this that they receive gold and goods, honor and glory, as St. Paul says in Rom. 16:18: 'Such serve their own belly and not our Lord Jesus Christ.'... and so regularly they are reproached in all the prophets as covetous and belly-servers."

In 1619 the theological faculty at Wittenberg applied Rom.16:17 to the Calvinists. Discussing the right and duty of the members, "the sheer," to pass judgment in ecclesiastical controversies, John Gerhard, "arch-theologian" of Lutheranism wrote in his Loci Theologici, I,22,454: "In Rom. 16:17 the apostle teaches the Romans to mark those who cause divisions and offenses." In XXIII (An Ecclesia Possit Errare?), 9,113, as he discusses the need of constant watchfulness on the part of the faithful against error, he remarks: "Rom. 16:17 warns them to mark those who cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which they learned and to avoid them. That this apostolic guidance and warning was not given idly or without reason anyone may easily perceive who will compare the present state of the Roman church with its pristine condition as described in that letter of the apostle."

In his Examen Theol. Acroam., sometimes called "the last of the great textbooks of Lutheran orthodoxy," rising out of the German church, David Hollaz discusses every man's obligation carefully to seek out the true church, remarking also this, IV,1,35: "Christ commands to avoid false prophets, Matt. 7:15, and to turn away from them, Rom. 16:17," and his next paragraph makes it clear that he is speaking of Christian groups, where the Word is read and Christian baptism is still administered.

In the Wuerttemberger Summarien, ed. 1709, we read at this place: "In the midst of this greeting, however, Paul inserts an earnest admonition to be zealously on guard against false teachers, the creators of division and offense and the importers of a different doctrine than the Romans had received from the holy apostle; such they shall avoid, for they serve not Christ, but their belly, and seek their own advantage, use sweet and fair-sounding words, with nothing behind them, to mislead the people. ...Lessons: We see here 1) that this is always the devil's method, to sow false teaching, and schisms where the Gospel of Christ is taught and preached."

Das Weimarische Bibelwerk, 1768, comments: "...those who cause divisions and offenses (by new doctrines which they introduce)....their belly (they seek their own advantage)."

Let us sample a few more of the European scholars. In his well-known Katechismuserklaerung, p.330f., F. Brunn of Steeden remarks, "How often St. Paul speaks of 'pure, unfeigned' faith (I Tim. 1:5; 6:14)....How often our Lord himself admonishes to shun all false prophets....How often he commands to avoid all false teachers (Tit. 3:10; Rom. 16:17; usw.)." To the passage William Burkitt in his Expository Notes on the New Testament comments: "Observe here 1. How our apostle takes his leave and farewell of the Romans, with an admonition to them to take heed of persons that were erroneous in doctrine and scandalous in practise." Matthew Henry's famed Commentary describes the division-makers as "those who burthen the church with dividing and offending impositions, who uphold and enforce those impositions, who introduce and propagate dividing and offending notions... cause divisions and offences contrary to, and different from the doctrine which we have learned. Whatever varies from the form of sound doctrine which we have in the Scriptures opens a door to divisions and offences. If truth be once deserted, unity and peace will not last long.... Mark those.... Do not look only at the divisions and offences, but run up those streams to the fountain, and mark those that cause them... they serve their own belly, their carnal, sensual, secular interests; it is some base lust or other that they are pleasing; pride, ambition, covetousness, luxury, lasciviousness, these are the designs that they are really carrying on."

Dr. H. T. Wangemann, of Kammin and Berlin Mission Society fame, wrote a com-

mentary on Romans. At this place he remarks: "Contrary to the doctrine: The root of their aberrations is regularly a deviation in doctrine... The errorist passes his heresy off for the real higher truth and attempts to win others for it and thereby causes division and offense alongside the doctrine known and confessed by the church and contrary to it... The deeper reason is 'belly-service,' that is, not the doctrine of Christ, but the desires that rise from the belly - be it covetousness, ambition, pride - are the deeper sources of their sectarian activity." Walter Rohnert writes in his Dogmatik, 509: "Da aber die von Gott gewollte aeusser Gestalt der Kirche die Rechtgläubigkeit derselben ist, soll jeder die Teilnahme an irrgläubigen Kirchengemeinschaften meiden und den Anschluss an die rechgläubige Kirche suchen. Matt. 7: 15; 10:32.33; Rom. 16:17.18." Nor may we forget the words of Baier's Compendium Theol. Pos., III,13,37: "The toleration of erring persons, since it extends not only to the simple, but to entire communions and, therefore, at the same time to the public ministry itself and to heterodox teachers, conflicts with the command to convince, reprove, and avoid false teachers and propagators of error: Rom. 16:17."

In this country Dr. R.C.H. Lenski wrote at length on the passage before us in his commentary on Romans, pp. 916-920: "When those who hold this doctrine firmly reject those who refuse to hold it or some part of it, they cause no division, but prevent division by not giving room to those who do divide and disunite.... By its very nature every false doctrine divides.... He who knows his Bible will not be deceived. Paul's injunction is not to keep away only from total rejectors of the Gospel - what Christian ever needed such a warning? His injunction is to keep away from believers who are errorists and teach falsely. Not only the exact duplicates of the errorists of Paul's day are to be shunned, as though no new ones could arise, as though the new ones do not divide, tear, and set traps, as though all errorists new and old, great and small, are not related, all in the same class; but according to Paul himself (15:4), 'whatever things were written before, for our instruction were they written,' to be fully applied, not devitalized, evaded. Give up the effort to make Paul even a mild unionist.... 18) Paul here characterizes all errorists in and by their error, first as far as the Lord is concerned, then as far as innocent Christians are concerned.... The old, forced idea will drop away: 'they think merely of a luxurious life.' This does not fit even in Phil. 3:19. It is not a fact that every errorist seeks an easy life, panders to his belly. In thousands of cases errorists choose a hard lot in life, work and suffer to propagate their errors, perhaps even to die for them. The point is obedience. In the case of every error a Christian ceases to render absolute slave-like obedience to the Lord, and yields that obedience, not just to himself, - Paul puts it drastically: to their own belly, their own lower and lowest nature. It seems that Paul chose the word 'belly' from the fact of Eve's eating in obedience to Satan instead of refraining from eating in obedience to God."

In 1937 Dr. Th. Graebner reviewed Dr. Lenski's work in this fashion (Luth. Witness, June 1): "It is difficult to argue against his exegesis of 16:17-19, which he accepts as one of the fundamental texts 'against unionism, fraternization with errorists.' He says: 'The efforts to make Paul's words apply only to the most fundamental errors, like the denial of Christ's deity, atonement, incarnation, resurrection, leaves the door open to a host of other errors, as though these are not to be stamped out. Paul's 'contrary' in v. 17 covers all errors.' All in all, one of the most notable commentaries on one of the most important New Testament books."

Similarly, a tract on The Evangelical Lutheran Church issued by the Lutheran Book Concern of the Ohio Synod in 1925 declares, p.6f.: "But here we must meet another rash conclusion which is sometimes made even by weak Lutherans, viz.: Why then can we not fellowship with those churches in which we admit that there are Christians? This question is very deceptive, and must therefore be clearly answered in order that the Church of the Reformation may stand justified before the whole world. The reason is simply this: Because God's Word does not allow such carelessness and indifference. It says: 'Mark them which cause divisions among you contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.' We have to deal with

visible communions (congregations and preachers) who teach and defend false doctrine, and with such doctrines have caused the divisions and sects, and not with the invisible communion of saints."

Let us focus our attention now on "Missouri." For a century she spoke with one voice. Under the first object of the organization of Synod the Constitution specifies "a united defense against schism and sectarianism (Rom.16:17)." What the founding fathers meant is set forth by Dr. Walther in Der Lutheraner, III, 2: "Separatists (schismatics) or those who detach themselves are such as sever themselves not from the pure doctrine but only from the external fellowship of the church because hypocrites are commingled with it; as if, though their hypocrisy has not evidenced itself in manifest sins, the church might separate itself from these people who make an outward profession of Christianity (Maulchristen). Much rather should they demean themselves according to Matt. 13:29.30 and our Lord's dealing with Judas. For they are finally to put away from themselves only manifest and obstinate sinners after all steps of admonition according to Matt. 18 have proven fruitless. Sectarrians on the other hand, or heretics, are such as sever themselves from the true doctrine and in one or another article introduce ^{and} antisciptural, that is, false doctrine, disseminate it or at least adhere to it/obstinately defend it. Such the church shall avoid and put away, after it has admonished in vain once and again, Tit. 3:10; Rom. 16:17."

Let us call the roll of individual teachers.

Dr. C.F.W. Walther, Church and Ministry, Thesis VIII B: "Everyone is obliged, for the sake of his salvation, to flee all false prophets and to avoid fellowship with heterodox churches or sects. Rom. 16:17.18." The Lutheran Church, the True Visible Church, Thesis XXI C: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church rejects all fraternal and churchly fellowship with those who reject its confession in whole or in part. Rom. 16:17."

Dr. H.C. Schwan, Presidential Address to the Central District, 1867: "Accordingly, unity of faith is an absolutely indispensable prerequisite for church fellowship. Where they do not even earnestly desire this, there certainly the words apply, Avoid them." He spoke in days when the question of joining the General Council lay before Missouri.

Dr. W. Sihler, Denkschrift, 1871, p. 16, presenting reasons why the synods organizing the Synodical Conference could not join hands with existent groups: "In these and similar passages of Holy Writ (Rom.16:17; Tit. 3:10) we have before us the express and earnest command of God not to remain in church-fraternal fellowship with false teachers and heretical persons." He applied this also to the newly-formed General Council.

Dr. G. Stoeckhardt, Commentary on Romans, ad loc.: "Here, then, stands God's command that Christians shall shun not only false doctrine, but also false teachers and keep themselves apart from such religious societies as tolerate error and errorists. All unionism, which joins truth with error in the same ecclesiastical organism, is condemned by this word of the apostle - and that is God's Word."

Dr. F. Bente's presentation of the passage in like fashion in Lehre und Wehre in the first years of this century is very well-known.

Dr. A.L. Graebner, Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, sec. 128: "In His spiritual kingdom of grace Christ, the only Head of His Church, rules His spiritual subjects jointly and severally by His Word, which alone in the Church is the law of the realm demanding unconditional obedience,... Rom. 16:17."

Dr. F. Pieper adduces the passage over two dozen times in his Christliche Dogmatik in such fashion: I,35: "Wie die Schrift oft und ernst vor der Abweichung

von der Lehre der Apostel, die Christi eigene Lehre ist, warnt (Roem. 16:17), so weist sie auch reichlich auf die Beweggruende fuer dieses Tun hin. In allgemeiner Bezeichnung nennt sie als Beweggrund das eigene Interesse. Roem. 16:18." I,55: "Wohl aber ist der Kirche befohlen, die falschen Lehrer nicht in der Kirche zu dulden, sondern sie mit Gottes Wort zu bekaempfen. Die gebotene Bekaempfung mit Gottes Wort schliesst in sich, die falschen Lehrer als solche, naemlich als solche, die vom Apostelwort abweichen, zu erkennen (Roem. 16:17), sie zu widerlegen (Tit. 1: 9.11), sie zu isolieren, das ist, mit ihnen keine kirchliche Gemeinschaft zu halten (Roem. 16:17; 2 Joh. 10), und sie eventuell, wenn sie nicht selbst kirchenfluechtig werden, von der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft foermlich auszuschliessen." I,99: "Jede Abweichung von Christi Word, das die Kirche im Wort seiner Apostel hat, wird ausdruecklich als ein Aergernis bezeichnet (Roem. 16:17)."

Thus also in his essay on Unionism, 1924, he wrote: "A third objection that needs to answered, because it is closely related to the former is: We ought to remember that there are Christians in the other churches. Most assuredly we do acknowledge all men who confess that they are damnable sinners and who believe in Christ as the only Savior from sin as fellow-members of the Christian Church. The same Spirit of God who kindled faith in Christ in ^{our} hearts has performed this wonderful work in those Christians who are found in heterodox churches. But in their case it is a matter of weakness in knowledge, and it is contrary to God's Word and will that they who are Christians maintain fellowship with the Roman Catholic or with sectarian churches. In other words, they are in the wrong camp. What they ought to do is to leave those churches which mutilate the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ, or dream of a revelation of God's grace without the means of grace. Oh, that all Christians would take to heart the admonition of St. Paul, Rom. 16:17."

Dr. L. Wessel, Proof Texts of the Catechism, p. 258: "In the light of this passage judge of the union services as practised by various denominations. Observe, too, how strongly it condemns pulpit--fellowship and altar-fellowship with errorists. It pains us, it is true, to keep aloof from all other denominations, but here is the command of God: 'Avoid them!' This command is clear; we cannot refuse obedience to God."

Dr. P.E.Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, N.T., Vol. II: "Paul distinctly tells the Roman Christians and the true believers of all times that they are not only to reject the false doctrine, but also to avoid the false teachers of every kind and degree. It is the express will of God that Christians and Christian organizations with sound Biblical basis must separate themselves, and remain separate, from all denominations in which false doctrine and false teachers are permitted."

In a letter of April 30, 1946, to the clergy of Synod, Pres. J.W. Behnken, reporting on a meeting with Chicago Statement signers, wrote: "At this meeting we voiced our disagreement with some of the points in A Statement as well as with the accompanying letter and insisted that these be corrected or withdrawn." In the organizing meeting with the committee he appointed to meet with the Statement signers the President pointed specifically to the treatment of Rom. 16:17 in A Statement as one of the points to "be corrected or withdrawn."

Dr. Th. Engelder, Notes on Unionism, p. 2: "Scripture explicitly forbids religious unionism in that it requires us to avoid those who teach and uphold the pure doctrine and to avoid all churches and organizations that teach and uphold false doctrine. God will have nothing but His pure Word preached in the Church. Jer. 23: 28-32; John 8:31f. He does not sanction false doctrine, but commands all men to shun it. Rom. 16:17."

Dr. Th. Laetsch, Concordia Theological Monthly, VI,9: "The apostle therefore has in mind only such outspoken, anti-Christian errorists as openly and flatly deny every fundamental truth of Christianity. He does not say, Avoid such as subvert completely the Christian truth or as at least deny some of the basic doctrines of the

Bible. He warns us against such as cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned. Contrary to, para, properly beside, alongside of, side by side with; hence these teachers may still be professing and teaching parts of the Christian doctrine. But side by side with this doctrine they make dissensions and thus cause offenses."

Dr. J.H.C. Fritz, Pastoral Theology, p.218: "Since religious unionism is forbidden by all those Scripture-passages in which the Lord warns against false doctrine and false teachers, Matt. 7:15; 16:6; Rom. 16:17.18....a pastor and his congregation should not take part in unionistic religious movements of any kind, unionistic church services, unionistic church-work, and the like." Again, in This Church of Ours, 1947: "God tells us to avoid them that cause divisions and offenses contrary to the revealed doctrine of the Word of God, Rom. 16:17. The reverence which we ought to have toward God should prevent us from falsifying His Word or fellowshiping those who do."

Dr. J.T. Mueller, Christian Dogmatics, p. 559: "What has just been said should not lead anyone to regard religious unionism (syncretism, Unionismus, Religionsmengerei) as permissible, much less as laudable. The words "with charity toward all" apply indeed to all men, for Christians are commanded to love all men, Matt. 22:39; 5:44; 1 John 3:17.18; but they do not mean that Christians should countenance false prophets and their errors, Matt. 7:15; Gal. 1:8.9. The direction of Scripture with regard to this point is clear and emphatic, Rom. 16:17, etc."

Dr. L.W. Spitz in The Abiding Word, Vol. I, p. 286: "God's command simply says: 'Avoid them' (Rom. 16:17). It is not a charitable act to confirm anyone in error by apparently ignoring it; but this is done when churches join in ecclesiastical functions without first eliminating offensive doctrinal errors, or when an individual joins a heterodox church in public worship."

Dr. F.W. Mayer, American Churches, p.52: "Scripture admonishes us to have visible fellowship only with those who are agreed with us in doctrine (1 Cor. 1:10) and to avoid those who teach errors (Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 6:3ff.). By refusing to have fellowship with errorists who still believe in Jesus, we do not destroy the spiritual unity; we do not thereby deny that they are Christians. By not worshiping with an errorist we condemn only his errors. And that is our duty, because God's Word has condemned them."

Prof. W.A. Baepler in The Abiding Word, Vol. II, pp.509-511: "It is the duty of every Christian to avoid error and fellowship with errorists.... But the Scriptures actually forbid spiritual association with those who depart from the truth. Rom. 16:17 we read:.... To fellowship with such as do not agree with us in doctrine is called unionism. And we repudiate unionism, that is, joint church work or worship with adherents of unorthodox church bodies, because thereby the truth is either denied or the appearance of denial or at least of indifferentism is given in disobedience to God's command, as causing divisions in the Church (Rom. 16:17; 2 John 9:10) and as involving the constant danger of losing the Word of God entirely."

Dr. Th. Graebner, mimeographed class notes (1938-39) on Romans 16:17: "The apostle Paul, we may assume, left the words in this general form because he wished to issue a warning which would be comprehensive enough to include false teachers of every kind." In The Merger, a reprint of 1918 Lutheran Witness articles on the formation of the United Lutheran Church, p. 7: "What we complain of with regard to all the bodies mentioned above is, that the Christians in those bodies permit those with whom they are united to teach false doctrine and to practise contrary to Scriptures. We cannot pick out the good Christians in those bodies and say: With you we shall fellowship. Why not? Because, 1) We cannot read the hearts. We cannot tell which of the Masons in the General Synod and General Council or in the Reformed churches believe in Jesus Christ, and how many believe in the god of the lodge and hope to be saved by good works, by living 'on the level and by the square.' 2) Even

if we could find the true Christians, we would have to tell them; By permitting errorists to speak in your church and for your church, and by supporting and taking part in unchristian practises, you sin against the Word of God, which forbids such alliance with error. Rom. 16,17." He quotes the Theol. Quarterly on p. 20: "It is the duty of every Christian to keep aloof from, and avoid, all fellowship and cooperation with heterodox churches. If there be those who will not continue in Christ's Word, and refuse to teach and observe what Christ has commanded us, their fellowship must not be sought, but avoided."

Discussing unionism in the Homiletic Magazine, XLIV, 566f., Dr. Graebner wrote: "Our basis for this position is the doctrine of Holy Scripture regarding the clearness of the Bible as a book of revealed truth. Those who take any other stand must assume either that God could not or did not desire to speak so plainly that men may understand what was in His mind and what He intended to reveal to them. Either would be blasphemy. We have the direct command to 'remain in His truth' and to 'teach men to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded us,' and we have the divine prohibition, Rom. 16:17. Really, this is all there is to the anti-unionistic argument, and I believe it is plenty. It is an all-inclusive principle. Anyone who limits, for instance, the application of the confessional principle only to the Reformed is neither logical in his thinking nor consistent in his practise. If I am permitted, e.g., to conduct jointly a Thanksgiving service with a Lutheran minister whom I hold to be a Christian at heart, though he be identified with a neutral or opposition body of Lutherans, then I must do the same in the case of a Methodist, Baptist or Catholic, whom I hold to be a Christian at heart. Unless I do this, I not only act on a premise which makes of Lutheranism a sect, but I would most uncharitably discriminate against the brethren (we know there are such) among the Reformed and Papists. I can understand a man who is ready for union with any one who calls himself a Christian; but I do not understand how a Lutheran can, in his relation to those who bear the Lutheran name, cast overboard the confessional principle and establish fellowship with those Lutherans whom he 'believes to be Christians at heart.' I hope that it makes no difference to us whether a man in his relation to God is either 'Missourian' or 'Christian'; or shall we make a sect also of our Missouri Synod? There is only one escape from these dilemmas; that connection which a man publicly holds decides his confessional status. nothing else. If he is a Lutheran at heart, but a brother to errorists, I cannot fellowship him without establishing the rule that it is the invisible faith in the heart which decides Christian fellowship - a rule which would lead to utmost confusion and which would be un-Lutheran and un-Scriptural."

In a meeting of the President's Committee on A Statement with the Chicago Statement's proponents on Sept. 25, 1946, Dr. Graebner moved the adoption of the following declaration, presented by the President's Committee in answer to point 5 of A Statement: "The passage Rom. 16:17.18 is applicable to any and all who persistently teach contrary to Apostolic doctrine and not merely to such as teach faith-subverting errors." However, for the sake of a complete record it must be added that in the Lutheran Witness of Feb. 25, 1947, this footnote appeared: "We incline to the notion, supported by more than 30 commentaries which we have consulted, that Rom. 16:17f. refers to un-Christian enemies of the Church who by deceitful tactics are trying to seduce Christians, undermining and frustrating the Christian message;" and that Dr. Graebner declared to the 1947 convention, after its reaffirmation of the Brief Statement of 1932, that he stands by every word of the Chicago Statement,

Dr. Wm. Arndt wrote in Christian Prayer (1937), p. 65: "Whoever is altering the teachings of Jesus thereby is creating a division in the Church, placing himself in opposition to all who adhere to Christ's doctrine. We have been told by St. Paul that we must avoid such division-makers, Rom. 16,17. That implies of course that we do not have prayer-fellowship with them. This same admonition holds with respect to those who are not the originators but the perpetuators of the divisions, carrying on the work of the captains of strife, discord, and disharmony by teaching the same errors as these men. A number of generations have passed between Roger Williams

who was one of the first to teach Baptist principles in what we now call the United States, and a present-day adherent of such principles, and the latter may be as peaceful and gentle a member of our race as you care to meet; still by perpetuating the false teachings of Roger Williams, he is helping to continue the division which these teachings have caused among those that bear the Christian name, and one cannot see how such a one can prove that we do not have to apply Romans 16,17 against him and say to him that, as long as he maintains such divisive principles, he is placing a barrier between himself and us, obstructing prayer-fellowship."

Again, to complete the record it must be added that when these words came under discussion in the meeting of the President's Committee with the Statement signers in November 1946 Dr. Arndt stated with regard to Rom. 16:17-18: "I have changed my position."

In May 1941 the faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, rendered an opinion on prayer-fellowship in which we read: "Prayer-fellowship with those of a heterodox faith is forbidden in Scripture. All texts in which we are admonished to keep the doctrine pure, as Josh. 1:7,8; John 8:31,32; Gal. 1:8,9; Titus 1:9, and all texts in which we are warned against false teachers and their false doctrines, as Jer. 23: 31,32; Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17; Col. 1:8, 20-22; 2 Tim. 4:2-4; 1 John 4:1, forbid pulpit-fellowship, altar-fellowship, and prayer-fellowship with the heterodox."

The faculty of Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, in a letter of Oct. 26, 1945, expressing disapprobation of A Statement to the chairman of the signers' group, objected: "Moreover, one of the chief texts which forbid all unionism, including prayer fellowship, with heterodox teachers (not all heterodox Christians), Rom. 16: 17,18, you presume to eliminate as applicable to all heterodox teachers."

The Synodical Catechism, Qu. 186, asserts: "We use the doctrine of the Church properly... D. When we avoid all false churches and all other organizations that profess a religion that is false.... Rom. 16:17;" also, Qu. 326: "The Lord's Supper must be denied D. To those of a different faith, since the Lord's Supper is a testimony of the unity of faith... Rom. 16:17."

Know the Truth, a manual for adult instruction prepared by Pastors A. Doerffler and W. H. Eifert for the Literature Board of Synod, teaches, p. 17: "Our obligations to a true Christian congregation:2. To avoid congregations which teach doctrines contrary to the Word of God. Rom. 16:17."

Concordia Cyclopedia, edited by Drs. Fuerbringer, Engelder, Kretzmann, p.774: "The indifferent and pacifist stand of the unionist is condemned in all those texts which bid us beware of false prophets and to be separate from those who deny the truth. Titus 1,13,14; 1 Tim. 2,12; 6,14; 2 Tim. 3,5; 6,3-5; Matt. 7,15; Jer. 23,28; Acts 20,29; Rom. 16,17; 1 John 4,1; 2 John 10,11."

Drs. Engelder, Graebner, Arndt, Mayer wrote in Popular Symbolics, sec. 145: "All Christians are bound to adhere only to such churches and organizations that teach the pure doctrine and to avoid all churches and organizations that teach and uphold false doctrine. God will have nothing but His pure Word preached in the Church. Jer. 23:28-32; John 8:31f. He does not sanction false doctrine, but commands all men to shun it. Rom. 16:17."

It is patent that, with the exception of the novel position recently espoused by the signers of the Chicago Statement of 1945, there has been in the public teaching of our Synod throughout its history a consensus on Romans 16:17,18. That agreement was reemphasized by the resolution of the 1947 convention "That our Synod again declare that the Brief Statement correctly expresses its doctrinal position." That resolution, accepted without dissenting vote, included adoption of the words of section 28: "All Christians are required by God to discriminate between orthodox

heterodox church-bodies, Matt. 7:15, to have fellowship only with orthodox church-bodies, and, in case they have strayed into heterodox church-bodies, to leave them, Rom. 16:17. We repudiate unionism, that is, church-fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine, as disobedience to God's command, as causing divisions in the Church, Rom. 16:17; 2 John 9,10, and as involving the constant danger of losing the Word of God entirely, 2 Tim. 2:17-21." The grave declarations therein made are most certainly not based on a passage that is an "exegetical problem." Missouri has not been in the habit of functioning in such fashion.

Let us recall Dr. Pieper's words (Chr. Dogm., III, 487f.): "A church body does not lose its orthodox character by the casual intrusion of errors. What the apostle Paul declared to the elders of Ephesus: 'Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them,' was not only experienced by the apostolic church, but was true in the church of the Reformation, and will be true in the church to the Last Day. Then does a church first forfeit the name "orthodox" when it no longer acts according to Rom. 16:17, that is, does not reprove and finally reject the error that has arisen, but lets it go on unchecked and thus, in reality, grants it equal rights with the truth."

III

CONCLUSIONS

1. Romans 16:17-18 is a clear passage and is, as such, correctly cited in our Confessions and in the Brief Statement, section 28.
2. The passage is applicable also in our times and is given by our Lord to be applied today.
3. The passage is applicable to any and all who persistently teach contrary to apostolic doctrine and their adherents, and not merely to such as teach faith-subverting errors.
4. Therefore the passage forbids church fellowship with any heterodox church body and those who support it.
5. Therefore the passage regulates our conduct also toward such Lutheran churches in America, and their members, as teach and adhere to false doctrines.
6. The passage applies also to the practise of public joint prayer.
7. Fellowship must be denied to those who refuse to skopein, i.e., to be on guard against false teachers.
8. Fellowship must be denied to those who after due admonition refuse to ekklinete, i.e., to "avoid them," when division- and scandal-makers carry on their work of making divisions in a church body.

February 3, 1948

- - - - -

A limited number of extra copies of this paper are available at 15 cents a copy. Address H. W. Romoser, 233 N. Cuyler Ave., Oak Park, Ill.

NOTES ON ROMANS 16:17. 18

H. W. ROMOSER

The Central Regional Pastoral Conference of the Northern Illinois District, meeting February 3- 4, 1948, adopted this paper without dissenting vote and resolved to make it available to the members of the conference. "It was also moved that with 'the permission of the officers of the conference any individual or group be permitted to have this paper published if such opportunity is available."

Parakaloo de humas, adelpihoi, skopein tous tas dichostasias kai ta skandala para teen didacheen heen humeis emathete poiountas, kai ekklinete ap autoon;

Hoi gar toioutoi too kurioo heemon Christoo ou douleuousin alia tee he autoon koilia, kai dia tees chreestologias kai eulogias exapatoosin tas kardias toon akakoom.

Now I beseech you, brethren mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

A word of explanation is necessary. Last Fall the Conference assigned a review of the Presidency's Theses on Fellowship to me. Within the past two weeks President Behnken made the announcement that the first set of theses to be issued will deal with 'The Church,' to be followed thereafter by theses on fellowship. At the same time, on the basis of the reaffirmation of the Brief Statement by the 1947 convention, he stated that the theses to be issued will, of course, not depart from the declared position of Synod. He pointed out that we study doctrines constantly in order to strengthen ourselves in the conviction we hold and pointed to the propriety of continuous study of our official position. Since Romans 16:17 is cited on fellowship both in our synodical Constitution and in the Brief Statement, and with the thought that the Conference would wish to study material related to the subject originally assigned for these hours, I have prepared notes on Romans 16:17-18 for consideration today.

To offer a discussion of this passage is not to suggest that it is unclear or that it requires extensive exegesis. These notes are presented, rather, in the sense of Dr. Pieper's words in his Christliche Dogmatik: "The entire Christian doctrine lies revealed in such passages as are equally accessible to the learned and the unlearned, and therefore require no exegesis in the sense of clarification of obscurities" I,434. See also 435. "This fact is the basis of all exegetical activity" I,434. "All exegesis must be tested by the clearer light of Scripture" I,436. The function of Scriptural exegesis when dealing with clear passages is not to offer exposition of what is self-evident from the text, but to ward off false interpretations and thus "lead the fickle human spirit back to the bare Scripture without exegesis" I,436.

We shall first consider the vocabulary and syntax of the two verses, then look at what we may call a "catalog of testimonies," and finally draw the necessary conclusions.

I

No question is raised with regard to the parakaloo which introduces verse 17. It means to "admonish, beg, entreat, exhort, beseech." "I beseech" you is entirely adequate.

The conjunctive particle de which follows was originally an adverb, carrying a sense of "on the other hand, on the contrary." It is weaker than alla, stronger than kai in the conjunctive use. In his Greek Grammar for Colleges Herbert Weir Smyth, sec. 2834-6, calls it "adversative and copulative." The word marks a transition to something new, to be distinguished from what has preceded, in this case vv. 1-16. The sequence of the chapter is this: Greetings are extended to individuals in the first fifteen verses. V. 16 presents a summary: "Salute one another with a holy kiss. The churches of Christ salute you." These people are brethren and sisters in the faith. They are to show it through friendly, loving conduct toward one another. But the apostle is constrained to speak also of those who make trouble,

divisions, offenses in the church. He introduces the material of v. 17. These disturbers may come at any time; they also will want the holy kiss, will wish to be received as brethren; but "Don't kiss these." Thus H. E. Jacobs in the Lutheran Commentary on Romans at this place writes: "The unity of the church presented in the greetings suggests the hindrances that mar it elsewhere; and this leads to the considerations that threaten the future, near or remote, of every church, however harmonious and prosperous."

No question is raised with regard to humas adelphoi. This was a precept given to the Christians in Rome; it is a direction for us, for the precepts and promises of Scripture, unless specifically abrogated by God, apply to all ages. E.g., Matt. 5:13: "Ye are the light of the world;" John 20:22: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins, etc.;" all commandments; Matt. 28:20: "Lo, I am with you always." In our approach also to this passage we shall do well to remember the words of Stalker in his Trial, and Death of Jesus Christ, p.273: "The Bible is a book for every generation; and the deduction of the message which it is intended to convey to the present day is as truly the task of the interpreter. There is a species of exegesis, sometimes arrogating to itself the sole title to be considered scientific, by which the garden of Scripture is transmuted into an herbarium of withered specimens."

No difficulty occurs with regard to skopein. The verb has its root in skopee, "an outlook place, a Watchtower," and skopia, "a lookout place." The Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon gives its *meaning* as "1) to look at or after a thing; 2) metaph.: to look to, consider, examine, take heed." Thayer remarks in the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament; "Skopein is more pointed than blepein; often equivalent to scrutinize, observe. when the physical sense recedes, equivalent to fix one's (mind's) eye on, direct one's attention to anything in order to get it, or owing to an interest in it, or a duty towards it." "Mark, be on the lookout for" is the sense here, inculcating a constant watchfulness against danger at any time from any direction.

It is to be noted that we are dealing here with a word used in a derived sense - without objection from anyone as to the translation. Cf. also ekklinete. More will be said of this later.

On the infinitive form here Smyth remarks, op. cit., 2013; "The infinitive may be used for the second person of the imperative.... This infinitive is commoner in poetry than in prose (where it has a solemn or formal force)." and adds, "This infinitive may be used in conjunction with an imperative," as occurs here.

Ekklinete is used three times in the New Testament: 1 Pet.3:11, "Let him eschew evil;" Rom. 3:12, "They are all gone out of the way;" and here, "Avoid them." L. & S. defines this use: "To turn away apo tinos," from someone.

The scope of the direction is fixed by the context. Throughout this chapter St. Paul has been dealing with religious fellowship, fellowship in the church.- not all intercourse. His prohibition does not cover the latter; that would be a command impossible to execute, as Dr. Pieper pointed out in his 1924 essay on Unionism, referring to 1 Cor. 5 "where the apostle says that the Christians would have to leave the world entirely if they did not want to associate in any manner whatsoever with their fellowman. According to God's own order Christians should rather be shining lights in this world." To urge the absolute application of ekklinete would make mission work on advocates of error, Christian or non-Christian, an impossibility, would forbid us to hear any word spoken or to read any word written by a scoffer, would perhaps keep us off all busses and trains, out of all stores, and the like.

The usage of tous poiountas here is regular. Says Smyth, sec. 1153: "The article has the power to make substantival any word or words to which it is prefixed. ...b. Participles (with indefinite force): ho boulomenos, whoever wills." Sec. 1124:

"A participle with the article may denote an entire class; ho houlomenos, any one who wishes... ho logopoiquentes, newsmongers, D. 4,49... The same sense is expressed by pas ho with a participle or adjective." His comment in sec. 1123 is also of interests "In the singular the generic article makes a single object the representative of the entire class; in the plural it denotes all the objects belonging to a class. The generic article is especially common in the plural, with adjectives used substantivally: ouk an tis eipoi hoos tous kakourgous kai adikous eia katagelan, no one could say that he permitted the malefactor and the wrongdoer to deride him."

The verb means (L. & S.) "to make, produce, create.... II. of abstract things, to bring to pass, bring about, cause." The use of the participle, here in the present, to indicate the stage of action is familiar. Poiountas is the object of skopein and ekklinete: "Mark, avoid those who make." There is, of course, nothing in the text to justify the translation "seek to make." We note also that the participle is masculine, not neuter, referring to people. Surely, the injunction is directed also against false doctrine; but the Holy Spirit speaking through St. Paul knew better than to use the masculine when He intended the neuter, that is, did not say "errorists" when He meant only to refer to error.

We shall withhold discussion of the articles tas and ta attached to dichostasias and skandala for a few moments. Dichostasia is translated as "divisions" here and in 1 Cor. 3:3 (where the margin is "factions"), and as "seditions" in Gal. 5:20. It does not occur otherwise in the New Testament. The word derives from the adverb dicha, meaning "in two, asunder, apart," and steenai, "to stand." The verb dichostateoo means to "stand apart, disagree." The noun, then, signifies "a standing apart, division, faction, dissension, sedition."

Skandalon here corresponds to the skandaleethron of classical usage. Originally it meant a "stick in a trap (on which bait is placed)." L. & S. defines it as "a trap or snare laid for an enemy. Metaphorically: a stumbling block, offense, scandali" In the New Testament it is variously translated as "occasion of stumbling (margin: scandal), occasion to fall, offense., stumbling block, thing that offendeth (margin: scandal)." It designates any person or thing by which one is entrapped, caused to fall, drawn into sin and error. The verbal background of the word should be borne in mind; skandalidzoo occurs 29 times in the N. T. We note with regard to this word also that it is used here in a derived sense.

Para has the root sense of "beside, alongside of." L. & S. defines its use: "C. with acc. - 4c. contrary to, against. Para to dikajon, Thuc. 5,90; para tas spondas, tous nomous, Thuc. i,67, etc." We read in Thayer: "III. 2. beside, beyond, that is, metaphorically a. equivalent to 'contrary to'; para teen didacheen, Rom. 16,17." We may add another note from L. & S. ; "C. with Acc. it properly denotes a coming to the side of an object or motion alongside it." This is of interest in connection with the sense of continuing advocacy of error which makes a person a division-maker.

Didachee in the N. T. means "teaching," either the act of teaching or, much more frequently and commonly, "the material taught." It refers to what the Romans, in this instance, had learned from the apostolic teaching activity, e.g., on God, sin, the person of Christ, justification, election, sanctification, means of grace, law and gospel, Christian love (Hoerber, A Grammatical Study of Romans 16,17, pp. 29- 30). Extended comment on this usage in the passage before us is unnecessary since it is agreed also by the author of the essay on these verses in Speaking the Truth in Love and his collaborators that the whole body of doctrine it meant (Report of President's Committee on A Statement, p. 8, sec. 4a: "Both parties held that didachee means the entire corpus of doctrine, every doctrine taught by Christ and the Apostles." Also, p. 4, sec. 4c, quoting Speaking the Truth; "'Which teaching? The whole body of Christian doctrine? Probably.'" Footnote: Charged to 'certainly' in the November [12-15, 1946] meeting [of the 10 and 10] by the author."). This being granted, that didachee is here used in the plain sense in which it appears throughout

the N. T. unless restricted by a modifier, it is not permissible to shrink the term to mean a single doctrine of the corpus, since there is no justification in the context for assuming such a synecdoche.

The article teen attached to didacheen does indeed 'point to something coming.' That "something" is given in the clause which immediately follows: heen emathete, "which you have learned." In A Grammatical Study of Romans 16, 17 Dr. R. G. Hoerber concisely remarks, p.30: "The specific article teen does not limit the noun didacheen to any singly doctrine of systematized dogmatics; it merely connects the noun with the relative clause heen humeis emathete. The context limits the noun only by the clause, 'which you learned.' Did the Christians at Rome learn only the doctrine of law and gospel, or only the doctrine of Christian love, or only the doctrine of justification? Or were they instructed in all the teaching of the apostles and prophets? To whom would St. Paul apply these words? Would he wish the Christians at Rome to avoid only those people who insisted on circumcision and to join with those who denied the resurrection of Christ? Would Paul be pleased if the Christians at Rome shunned only the quarrelsome individuals and extended the hand of fellowship to those who denied that Jesus was the Son of God? The answers to these questions are obvious. The confusion arises when an attempt is made to interpret a specific article as implying only one single phase of St. Paul's teaching or only one single doctrine as catalogued in systematized dogmatics. The specific use of the definite article, as observed previously, can infer 'the well-known' only when the context gives such permission. In Romans 16,17 the only limitation in the context to the phrase teen didacheen is the relative clause 'which you learned.'" Further, we note the striking parallel of this phrase, "the doctrine which ye have learned," with Paul's words in 6:17; "Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you," hupeekousate de ek kardias eis hon paradotheete tupon didachees.

To which part of the sentence is "the doctrine which ye have learned" attached? Shall we translate: "Those who make divisions and offenses which are against the doctrine you have learned" (the adjectival construction, para teen didacheen describing the divisions and offenses) or shall we translate: "Those who, contrary to the doctrine you have learned that there should be peace always, make divisions and offenses" (the adverbial construction, para teen didacheen modifying poiountas. If this be correct, we are commanded to avoid only those who, for any reason, disturb the peace.?) Some have argued that the latter construction, the adverbial is "normal use." That has been thoroughly answered by Dr. Hoerber with examples from both classical and N. T. sources (op. cit., pp. 5-10). The argument has been made that the absence of a relative article before para teen didacheen throws the phrase toward poiountas. That is also answered in the examples cited by Hoerber. Also, it is to be noted that such scholars as Phillipi, Hodge, Stoeckhardt, Thayer, Kittel, Ebeling, Robertson-Davis, Expositor's Greek Testament take the para phrase as an adjunct of the "divisions and offenses." Even Dr. Hamann, who espouses the adverbial construction, states that none of the authorities he consulted accept that construction. That the absence of the relative article before para is in no way decisive is indicated, for instance, by A. T. Robertson in his Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 784: "Phrases that are consciously verbal in origin" (cf. skandalon, skandalidzoo) "readily do without the repeated article." Again, commenting on the omission of such an article, he writes on p. 783: "It is much simpler and truer to say that the need of another article was not felt." Recall again Hoerber's remarks on teen didacheen. We therefore set aside the adverbial construction because of the denotation of didachee, the force of the articles before dichostasias and skandala, which point to the para phrase following, and the common understanding of the phrase as defining what sort of dichostasias and skandala are meant. Let us hear A. T. Robertson construe this verse in A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament, 1933, pp.200-201: "The verb (predicate) has two accusatives (humas, skopein). This infinitive skopeln has an object, the articular participle tous poiountas. This participle poiountas has two substantives as object and one prepositional adjunct, para teen didacheen. The substantive didacheen is further described by the relative

clause heen humeis emathete. It is all beautifully linked together in a perfectly transparent way radiating from the predicate verb parakaloo (the infinitive to the predicate, the participle to the infinitive, the substantives to the participle, the adjunct to the substantives, the relative clause to the adjunct."

We must remark further that if we accept the adverbial construction, i.e., "those who, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned not to make divisions, do make divisions, etc.," that would teach us that all divisions are forbidden and sinful. What right, then did the apostles have to leave the synagogue? Was Gerhard wrong when he exulted over Luther's work, "O seliges Schisma!?" Are Luther and the Saxons condemned by these verses? What shall we do with 1 Tim. 6:3--5, "From such withdraw thyself," with Titus 3:10, "An heretic reject," with 2 Cor. 6:17, "Come out from among them"? What of Jesus' words in Luke 12:51?

We turn to the articles tas and ta attached to dichostasias and Skandala. It is necessary to keep the terminology clear in dealing with the articles; there has been much confusion here. There is, of course, no indefinite article, "a, an," in Greek. All articles are definite, dividing into specific or particular and generic articles. Smyth, 1122: "The generic article denotes an entire class as distinguished from other classes." 1119: "The particular article denotes individual persons or things as distinguished from others of the same kind." The confusion in this matter, as evidenced by a varying use of the term "definite" in Speaking the Truth, p.40, has been pointed out by Hoerber, p. 27.

Let us note in passing that while Zahn translates these articles in reproducing the text, he does not italicize them, as has been done in quoting him. Also, if Zahn is to be cited as inserting the articles, we may note that in his commentary on Homans Brunner does not translate them.

There has been discussion whether these articles are generic or specific. Let us accept the proposition that they are specific. That does not mean, however, that they produce the meaning "the well-known divisions and offenses." The article means just what it says: THE. True, there is an anaphoric use of the specific article, involving, e.g., reference to something already mentioned or present to the mind or senses, but the context, written or social, must clearly indicate what it is. If the context does not make the reference clear and unmistakable, we may not assume an anaphoric use of the article. As Hoerber writes, p. 25, "The context alone can give the added connotation of 'the well-known.'" There is no such immediate or remote contextual identification in Homans. Consider the absurdity of it if we were to translate all specific articles with "the well-known" after the fashion of "the well-known divisions and offenses"!

Allow me to repeat. The specific article does not in itself identify. All it does is to serve notice on the reader that the writer has in mind a particular thing and bid the reader prepare to notice the identifying mark. This identifying mark will lie either in the context or in the modifying phrase, or be available from certain particular circumstances. Evidence for this fact is supplied also by this text itself, for Paul is not satisfied to identify the doctrine he referred to in the text with the bare article, teen didacheen, but adds the identifying mark, heen emathete. We recall that Luther found it impossible to identify from the passage Rom. 1:17, ho dikaios...; ek piddoos zeesetai, who was meant by ho dikaios just because the article was used; and that fact nearly drove him to despair. The identification of dikaios had to be made from the Pauline theology, from the context, not from the article. The context of Rom. 16:17-18 does not furnish an iota of evidence by which the identification could have been made. There is absolutely no proof that the Romans knew definite men or groups to whom Paul was referring as then carrying on their divisive activity. Cf. the commentators and their widely divergent guesses as to the persons or groups referred to -- Judaizers? Gnostics? Antinomian libertines?

But the articles do have a function. They indicate that "something is coming up" to define the diehostasias kai skandala. They point to the para phrase. In passing it may be remarked that it is absurd to assert that all articles in a given sentence must be alike, i.e., all generic or all specific. Everyday usage confutes that contention.

We reach the inevitable conclusion, therefore, that the phrases shall be construed as does Robertson: "who cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned," and not as teaching; "Avoid only those who, contrary to the doctrine you have learned that the peace is to be kept, make divisions and offenses." The warning is against any and all who propose doctrine "alongside, contrary to" the teaching of God's Word, the corpus doctrinae.

Per contra, let us assume for a moment that the para clause is attached to poiountas. Then tas dichostasias kai ta skandala stand alone and we are at a loss to find the antecedent explanatory reference. Also, we must deal with the statement of Robertson, p. 794, opposed to the "well-known divisions" theory; "No vital difference was felt between articular and anarthrous nouns (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 259)."

Let us turn now to v. 18. It is introduced by gar, a causal conjunction, for, nam, enim. Smyth, 2810, says: "It serves to introduce a cause of, or a reason for, an action before mentioned; to justify a preceding utterance, to confirm the truth of a previous statement." So also Thayer: "It adduces the cause or gives the reason of a preceding statement or opinion.... 3. To sentences in which something is commanded or forbidden gar annexes the reason why the thing must either be done or avoided." The usage is clear. The conjunction requires us to construe v. 18 as an adverbial clause stating God's reason for the command of v. 17. The verse must be referred to the verbs skopein and ekklinete. It may not be construed as a modifier of tous poiountas; such "interpretation would require an adjective modifier. We may not explain v. 18 as a limitation or characterization or description by which we are to recognize and identify tous poiountas. We are not to wait for corroboration from v. 18 to identify the persons mentioned in v. 17. We grant that characteristics of errorists are mentioned in v. 18. We grant that in specific instances God may also unveil such errorists as definitely living in the interest of their old Adam, and that such evidence would corroborate the correctness of the action prescribed in v. 17, ekklinete. But no one has the right to rely on such revelation or to hold the action enjoined in v. 17 in abeyance until such manifestation has been consummated. All the marks necessary for identification are given in v. 17; we are in duty bound to act when these marks are in evidence.

The fact that God passes a judgment which is also a description does not necessarily furnish us men with marks which we can recognize; e.g., Deut 18:10-12: "'There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through fire ... for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord;" Matt 7, 15: "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves;" Mark 10:14: "Suffer the little children... for of such is the kingdom of God." Each of these passages contains a characterization. Yet no one would attempt to identify the persons mentioned by the characterization which God makes in giving us the reason for the commands. The method is equally out of place in Rom. 16. The characterization of the poiountas in v. 18 is not serviceable to us for purposes of identification, for we cannot see who really serves Chr'st, and who pretends to serve Christ but serves his koilia. If it is claimed that v. 18 refers to hypocrites, identification would never be possible since we cannot identify a hypocrite until he has become a manifest sinner. The construction forbids us to translate in the sense "Avoid those... namely, they that serve not." That is not what is written.

The translation of hoi toioutoi as "they that are such" is adequate. Toioutos

corresponds to talis, "of such sort," i.e., those who cause divisions, etc. In this activity, in being such as cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine, they serve not the Lord Jesus Christ.

The poiountas here come into consideration not for their entire life, but only because of and with reference to their creation of divisions and scandals. In fact, nowhere in v. 17 or v. 18 is reference made to their faith or lack of faith. Only their activity is mentioned. Hence the expression ou douleuousin is to be applied to them only so far as the activity mentioned in v. 17 is concerned. In this matter of making divisions and offenses they do not serve Christ. We may note in passing that, indeed, some orthodox teachers may seek their own interests. Cf. Phil.1:15ff.

"They do not serve," ou douleuousin, we read. Note that not diakoneoo, but the very strong douleuoo is used. A doulos is a slave. Douleuoo is "to be a slave," in a derived sense "to serve or be subject to, to obey." One who is a slave serves his master unquestioningly. He hears the master's command; he exercises no contrary will of his own; he does exactly what he is ordered to do.

A Christian who corresponds to all these points is perfect. Hence if ou douleuousin means "no Christians," there are no Christians in the world, not even St. Paul, who in Rom. 7:25 said that he was divided in his allegiance, serving (douleuoo) Christ according to his spiritual nature, and sin according to his carnal nature. Thus he admits in himself a will contrary to that of God, Thus Luther remarks, IX, 452f: "So, then, the Christian is divided into two parts. In that he is flesh, he is under the Law; in that he is spirit, he is under grace."

The fact that the people of this text are not Christians cannot be deduced from the expression itself, for Christ used even stronger language when He called Peter "Satan." Nor may one argue that strong language is evoked only when fundamental errors are rebuked. All error is rebuked in sternest terms, for, as Paul writes to the Galatians, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," Gal. 5:9. The matter under discussion in Rom. 16 is the Christian doctrine, hence the strong language in v. 18; not nearly so strong as "Satan," however. Hence, if "Satan" does not mean that Christ called Peter no Christian, much less can ou douleuousin be said to deny a person's Christianity.

In considering v. 18 we must bear in mind that here God is declaring His judgment of those who cause and maintain divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine. He states the fact: "They serve not our Lord Jesus Christ." He does not make it our duty to ascertain whether faith is present. The command of v. 17 is to be obeyed, whether or not we can establish the individual's condition as to saving faith - and when is that absolutely possible?

The text gives no authorization to the translation "those who refuse to serve." God here does not refer us to the act of refusal, but states His verdict without describing the cause or manner of the person's action.

The noun koilia derives from the adjective koilos meaning any hollow form. The adjective passes through the noun koilon which L. & S. defines as "a hollow, cavity; esp. like koilia, of the cavities in the body, e.g., of the stomach, the heart, the hands, the foot, the side, the flank," The same lexicon defines koilha as "the large hollow or cavity of the body, the belly.. .alone,.. often used for the stomach and also for the different parts of the whole digestive system... The intestines, bowels...The excrements...any cavity in the body, a ventricle, chamber, as in the lungs, heart, liver, brain...The socket of a bone...Any hollow or cavity in the earth, in the clouds."

In the Septuagint koilia is used to designate the innermost thought-and-emotional life of a person. See, for example, Ps. 22:14; Song of Sol. 5:4; Isa. 16: 11; Lam. 1:20; Job 15:35; prov. 18:20.27.30. Some of these passages, if "belly" or

"bowels" is taken in the physical sense, become too shocking to quote here. However, we may illustrate what nonsense develops if a purely physical sense of koilia is insisted upon by these examples: "A man's belly (koilia) shall be satisfied with the fruit of his mouth," Prov. 18:20; "Their belly prepareth-deceit," Job 15:35. In the N. T. koilia is used 3 times where the context does not specify something physical (as it does in Matt. 19:12, koilia meetros). The three passages are John 7:38, Rom. 16:18, Phil. 3:19. John and Philippians are clearly metaphorical. It is entirely natural to understand Romans similarly as metaphorical, meaning the innermost thought-and-emotional life. So Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch, 1938 (Behm), says of koilia: "Eigentlich: a) Leibe shoehle. d. Gehimhoehle. In der Septuaginta - das Innerste... das verborgene Innere des Menschen, die Staette seiner Gedanken und Empfindungen. B. koilia in N. T. 1.c. das Innere, John 7:38."

We must note also that to define koilia as "gluttony, sexual appetite" is already to have departed from the literal sense of the word, to be using it in a derived sense. So Moffatt does: "Slaves of their own base desires." So the author of the essay on these verses in Speaking the Truth does not hold to the literal, primary sense when he says, "The disturbers... 2. are self-servers and, perhaps, even gluttonous," or again, "for whom the Gospel ministry is a means of gain, to quote Godet 'and gain the means of satisfying their gross passions.'" Both "gain" and "passions" are clearly derived senses of the word, metaphorical usage; you are not dealing with a literal rendering.

An application: It has been generally conceded in our midst that such a teacher as Fosdick comes under the description and application of this text. Yet it is impossible to identify an errorist like Fosdick, whose social life is above reproach, if the decision depends on anything beside his teaching. That he preaches as he does because he makes money thereby and would preach otherwise if there were no financial inducement cannot be proved. Nor dare one wait to see if he will deceive the simple, because that cannot be determined till the damage has been done.

It will be noted that if koilia is to be understood in the strictly literal sense, we will have to determine not merely whether a man is gluttonous, but whether he actually worships his belly and accords it the reverence and worship due a god.

Dia chreestologias. Dia denotes the means or instrument by which anything is effected, "through, by." Chreestologia is "fair speaking, plausible speech." It is a hapax legomenon in the N. T. L. & S. asserts that the word is used in both good and bad sense (Chrysostom) in ecclesiastical literature.

Eulogia appears 16 times in the N. T., 11 times as "blessing," twice as "bountifully," once as "bounty," once as "matter of bounty." L. & S. defines it as meaning, in an evil sense "a fair sound, speciousness."

Exapatousin occurs 5 times in the N.T., once as "beguile," four times as "deceive," A compound of apataoo, it means to "deceive or beguile thoroughly." Kittel calls attention to one of its senses: "Von suendlichen Selbstbetrug," (emphasis mine) 1 Cor. 3:18; Jas. 1:26." We read in 1 Cor. 3:18; "Let no man deceive himself;" in James 1:26 (simple apataoo) : "deceiveth his own heart." Certainly a deliberate, sinister, conscious purpose on the part of a man to deceive his own heart does not lie in that usage. We note also that Jesus said that those who would kill His disciples would think that they 'did God service.' Cf. also Paul's expressions in Acts 26:9; Phil. 3:6. Did these men with deliberate, sinister purpose against themselves deceive themselves? We may not inject this "deliberate, sinister purpose" motif into the verses before us.

Several practical questions suggest themselves here. How would I determine beyond peradventure of doubt that a person is guilty of actual belly-worship? How shall I determine that a man is a deliberate deceiver, a hypocrite, coming with sinister purpose? Will he tell me his purpose or can I read his heart? What purpose,

then, does the injunction of v. 17, under this interpretation, serve? Again, when it is a question of transferring members to a congregation whose pastor is not known to us, do we first investigate whether he is at heart a worshipper of that organ we call the stomach, whether he is in the ministry with intent to deceive? No, we are governed, of course, by his public confession and teaching as it is expressed in his denominational membership and public activity. One cannot go to California, Maine or Florida to investigate the private life of a pastor there every time a member asks transfer to his church!

Tas kardias, they deceive "the hearts" of the simple. Note the metaphoric use here again. Certainly no one will suggest that "heart" must be understood in the primary, literal sense of "an organ of the body."* It refers to the inmost life of the individual, the soul

Toon akakoon are the "simple" and "harmless." Thus the N. T. uses the word in two instances. L. & S. defines it as referring to those who are unknowing of evil, guileless, benignant, innocent, simple. It has a twofold sense: "without evil in self" and "expecting no evil." Further comment seems unnecessary. Let us only add the note: If we wait till we discover "sinister purpose" on the part of the poiountas, by seeing their effect on the guileless, the recognition comes to late - PERHAPS FOR US AKAKOI ALSO!

So sum up: Belly-service in false teaching may become apparent and may even take the form of gluttony or of gross sexual indulgence or, on the other hand, may be practised so secretly or be so hidden that only God sees and knows it, God, however, has not ordered us to mark and avoid only after we have established belly-serving as an aim or purpose of the false teaching that has appeared. He has made it our duty to identify the persons we should mark and avoid by their discernible activity, v. 17, the creation of divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine we have learned.

We draw together once more the major grammatical considerations of the verse, 1) Verse 18 may not be construed as a modifier of tous poiountas: 2) It may not be explained as a limitation, characterization, or description by which we are to recognize the poiountas. 3) It must be referred to the verbs skopein and ekklinete. 4) Therefore the v&rning and command in v. 17 may not be restricted to such false teachers and their adherents as cannot be considered Christians, but refers to all persistent false teachers and those who adhere to them.

God has spoken in these verses and He has spoken clearly. He is in earnest in His Word. 1 Pet. 4:11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Jer. 23:28ff.: "He that hath My word, let him speak My word faithfully, etc." 1 Cor. 1:10: "Now I beseech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." John 8:31f.: "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth." Matt. 28:20; "Teaching them to observe all things." And so the passages are multiplied. God is concerned that His Word be held and taught clearly and fully because of His holy wisdom and because of His infinite love for sinners, because He knows that each single error in teaching His Word is potentially destructive of faith, capable of leading men away from their eternal Savior. He tells us that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," that the word of errorists "doth eat like a cancer." Therefore His earnestness in Rom. 16:17, that hard command, and His stern judgment upon errorists in v. 18.

II

It is proper to consider a "catalog of testimonies." Certainly we shall not put the words of men in the place of the Word of God. Nor, on the other hand, do we wish to act as if all wisdom first came to birth in us. The fathers have things to tell and teach us, Heb. 13:7. Furthermore, we have given our assent to confessions of our church and have declared that a church's position is determined by its confessions, public teaching, and publications.

Let us first consult some of the translations. Luther: "Ich ermahne euch, liebe Brueder, dasz ihr aufsehet auf die, die da Zertrennung und Aergernis anrichten, neben der Lehre, die ihr gelernet habt, und weichet von denselbigen." The Vulgate runs in the same fashion, American Revised Version: "...them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine (teaching which ye learned; and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly, and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." Revised Standard Version: "I appeal to you, brethren, to take note of those who create dissensions and difficulties, in opposition to the doctrine which ye have been taught; avoid them. For such persons do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by fair and flattering words they deceive the hearts of the simple minded."

The Lutheran Confessions speak: Smalcald Articles, De. Pot., 41 (Trig. 516): "And Paul commands that false teachers be avoided and execrated as an abomination," This is written concerning the Pope and his adherents (suis membris) - at least some still Christians. The words are repeated in the Formula of Concord, Th. Decl. X, 22 (Trig. 1061). (Obviously, Rom. 16 is referred to; no book, chapter or verse citation appears in the original of either Confession.) The Formula continues: "It is a grave matter that one should separate oneself from so many lands and people, and profess a separate doctrine; but here stands God's command that everyone should beware of and not agree with those who maintain false doctrine or attempt to support it by means of cruelty."

Luther speaks on the passage repeatedly. We sample his remarks. XI, 1118f; "He speaks not about contrary doctrines, but about those that are placed alongside the true doctrine. They are the additions which cause division. That is what St. Paul calls a 'doctrine alongside' (Nebenlehre), an addition; and it is a stumbling block, an offense and by-way, since they would make consciences dependent on the things they advocate. The Gospel, however, is so tender and precious that it can tolerate no addition or human doctrine. The teachings of the priests as to how I shall get to heaven by fasting, praying, and similar works is only such a by-way, which the Gospel will not have; but they want it, therefore they are thieves and murderers; for they tear the conscience away, thereby butchering the sheep and destroying them. How is that done? If merely a by-path is made, then as a result my soul will be torn away from God, then I will perish. That selfsame by-path is therefore my murder and death; for the conscience and heart of man must rely on one single word, otherwise it cannot be preserved; for all flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field,' os saith Isaiah 40:6.

"The doctrines of men, let them be as attractive as they will, do perish and with them the conscience which has built thereon; there is neither help nor counsel. But the word of God is everlasting and must remain eternally, no devil can destroy it; that is the foundation which must be laid for the conscience, upon which it may be established eternally. The words of men and whatsoever depends on them go to ruin. Therefore they who do not enter through this door, that is, do not proclaim the pure, unadulterated Word of God without any addition, do not lay the right foundation; they ruin, kill and murder, and slaughter the sheep."

VIII, 1861; "Those who make divisions and offences, That is directed against all sorts of doctrines of men." XIV, 109 (Foreword to Romans): "The last chapter is a chapter of greetings; but with them he includes an important warning against

men's doctrines which intrude alongside the gospel teaching and cause offense." XIV,1859f: "In short, they [false teachers] contend constantly against the saving Word of God and the pure faith... For all of their teaching tends to this that they* receive gold and goods, honor and glory, as St. Paul says in Bom. 16:18: 'Such serve their own belly and not our Lord Jesus Christ.'... and so regularly they are reproached in all the prophets as covetous and belly-servers."

In 1619 the theological faculty at Wittenberg applied Rom. 16:17 to the Calvinists. Discussing the right and duty of the members, "the sheep," to pass judgment in ecclesiastical controversies, John Gerhard, "arch-theologian" of Lutheranism wrote in his Loci Theologici, I,22,454: "In Bom. 16:17 the apostle teaches the Romans to mark those who cause divisions and offenses." In XXIII (An Ecclesia Possit Errare?), 9,113, as he discusses the need of constant watchfulness on the part of the faithful against error, he remarks: "Bom. 16:17 warns them to mark those who cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which they learned and to avoid them. That this apostolic guidance and warning was not given idly or without reason anyone may easily perceive who will compare the present state of the Roman church with its pristine condition as described in that letter of the apostle."

In his Examen Theol. Acroam., sometimes called "the last of the great textbooks of Lutheran orthodoxy" rising out of the German church, David Hollaz discusses every man's obligation carefully to seek out the true church, remarking also this, IV,1,35: "Christ commands to avoid false prophets, Matt. 7:15, and to turn away from them, Bom. 16:17," and his next paragraph makes it clear that he is speaking of Christian groups, where the Word is read and Christian baptism is still administered.

In the Wuerttemberger Summarien, ed. 1709, we read at this place: "In the midst of this greeting, however, Paul inserts an earnest admonition to be zealously on guard against false teachers, the creators of division and offense and the importers of a different doctrine than the Romans had received from the holy apostle; such they shall avoid, for they serve not Christ, but their belly, and seek their own advantage, use sweet and fair-sounding words, with nothing behind them, to mislead the people. ...Lessons: We see here 1) that this is always the devil's method, to sow false teaching, and schisms where the Gospel of Christ is taught and preached."

Das Weimarische Bibelwerk, 1768, comments: "...those who cause divisions and offenses (by new doctrines which they introduce)....their belly (they seek their own advantage)."

Let us sample a few more of the European scholars. In his well-known Katechismuserklaerung, p.330f., F. Brunn of Steeden remarks, "How often St. Paul speaks of 'pure, unfeigned' faith (I Tim. 1:5; 6:14)....How often our Lord himself admonishes to shun all false prophets....How often he commands to avoid all false teachers (Tit. 3:10; Rom. 16:17; usw.)." To the passage William Burkitt in his Expository Notes on the New Testament comments: "Observe here 1. How our apostle takes his leave and farewell of the Romans, with an admonition to them to take heed of persons that were erroneous in doctrine and scandalous in practise." Matthew Henry's famed Commentary describes the division-makers as "those who burthen the church with dividing and offending impositions, who uphold and enforce those impositions, who introduce and propagate dividing and offending notions... cause divisions and offences contrary to, and different from the doctrine which we have learned. Whatever varies from the form of sound doctrine which we have in the Scriptures opens a door to divisions and offences. If truth be once deserted, unity and peace will not last long.... Mark those.... Do not look only at the divisions and offences, but run up those streams to the fountain, and mark those that cause them... they serve their own belly, their carnal, sensual, secular interests; it is some base lust or other that they are pleasing; pride, ambition, covetousness, luxury, lasciviousness, these are the designs that they are really carrying on."

Dr. H. T. Wangemann, of Kammin and Berlin Mission Society fame, wrote a com-

mentary on Romans. At this place he remarks: "Contrary to the doctrine: The root of their aberrations is regularly a deviation in doctrine... The errorist passes his heresy off for the real higher truth and attempts to win others for it and thereby causes division and offense alongside the doctrine known and confessed by the church and contrary to it... The deeper reason is 'belly-service,' that is, not the doctrine of Christ, but the desires that rise from the belly - be it covetousness, ambition, pride - are the deeper sources of their sectarian activity." Walter Rohnert writes in his *Dogmatik*, 509: "Da aber die von Gott gewollte aeusser Gestalt der Kirche die Rechtgläubigkeit derselben ist, soll jeder die Teilnahme an irrgläubigen Kirchengemeinschaften meiden und den Anschluss an die rechgläubige Kirche suchen. Matt. 7: 15; 10:32.33; Rom. 16:17.18." Nor may we forget the words of Baier's Compendium Theol. Pos., III,13,37: "The toleration of erring persons, since it extends not only to the simple, but to entire communions and, therefore, at the same time to the public ministry itself and to heterodox teachers, conflicts with the command to convince, reprove, and avoid false teachers and propagators of error: Rom. 16:17."

In this country Dr. R. C. H. Lenski wrote at length on the passage before us in his commentary on Romans, pp. 916-920: "When those who hold this doctrine firmly reject those who refuse to hold it or some part of it, they cause no division, but prevent division by not giving room to those who do divide and disunite....By its very nature every false doctrine divides.... He who knows his Bible will not be deceived. Paul's injunction is not to keep away only from total rejectors of the Gospel - what Christian ever needed such a warning? His injunction is to keep away from believers who are errorists and teach falsely. Not only the exact duplicates of the errorists of Paul's day are to be shunned, as though no new ones could arise, as though the new ones do not divide, tear, and set traps, as though all errorists new and old, groat and small, are not related, all in the same class; but according to Paul himself (15:4), 'whatever things were written before, for our instruction were they written,' to be fully applied, not devitalized, evaded. Give up the effort to make Paul even a mild unionist.... 18) Paul here characterizes all errorists in and by their error, first as far as the Lord is concerned, then as far as innocent Christians are concerned,... The old, forced idea will drop away: 'they think merely of a luxurious life.' This does not fit even in Phil. 3:19. It is not a fact that every errorist seeks an easy life, panders to his belly. In thousands of cases errorists choose a hard lot in life, work and suffer to propagate their errors, perhaps even to die for them. The point is obedience. In the case of every error a Christian ceases to render absolute slave-like obedience to the Lord, and yields that obedience, not just to himself, - Paul puts it drastically: to their own belly, their own lower and lowest nature. It seems that Paul chose the word 'belly' from the fact of Eve's eating in obedience to Satan instead of refraining from eating in obedience to God."

In 1937 Dr. Th. Graebner reviewed Dr. Lenski's work in this fashion (Luth, Witness, June 1): "It is difficult to argue against his exegesis of 16:17-19, which he accepts as one of the fundamental texts 'against unionism, fraternisation with errorists.' He says: 'The efforts to make Paul's words apply only to the most fundamental errors, like the denial of Christ's deity, atonement, incarnation, resurrection, leaves the door open to a host of other errors, as though these are not to be stamped out. Paul's 'contrary' in v. 17 covers all errors.' All in all, one of the most notable commentaries on one of the most important New Testament books."

Similarly, a tract on The Evangelical Lutheran Church issued by the Lutheran Book Concern of the Ohio Synod in 1925 declares, p. 6f,: "But here we must meet another rash conclusion which is sometimes made even by weak Lutherans, viz.: Why then can we not fellowship with those churches in which we admit that there are Christians? This question is very deceptive, and must therefore be clearly answered in order that the Church of the Reformation may stand justified before the whole world. The reason is simply this; Because God's Word does not allow such carelessness and indifference. It says: 'Mark them which cause divisions among you contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.' We have to deal with

visible communions (congregations and preachers) who teach and defend false doctrine, and with such doctrines have caused the divisions and sects, and not with the invisible communion of saints."

Let us focus our attention now on "Missouri." For a century she spoke with one voice. Under the first object of the organization of Synod the Constitution specifies "a united defense against schism and sectarianism (Rom. 16:17)." What the founding fathers meant is set forth by Dr. Walther in Der Lutheraner, III, 2: "Separatists (schismatics) or those who detach themselves are such as sever themselves not from the pure doctrine but only from the external fellowship of the church because hypocrites are commingled with it; as if, though their hypocrisy has not evidenced itself in manifest sins, the church might separate itself from these people who make an outward profession of Christianity (Maulchristen). Much rather should they demean themselves according to Matt. 13:29.30 and our Lord's dealing with Judas. For they are finally to put away from themselves only manifest and obstinate sinners after all steps of admonition according to Matt. 18 have proven fruitless. Sectarians on the other hand, or heretics, are such as sever themselves from the true doctrine and in one or another article introduce antisciptural, that is, false doctrine, disseminate it or at least adhere to it and obstinately defend it. Such the church shall avoid and put away, after it has admonished in vain once and again, Tit. 3:10; Rom. 16:17."

Let us call the roll of individual teachers.

Dr. C.F.W.Walther, Church and Ministry, Thesis VIII B: "Everyone is obliged, for the sake of his salvation, to flee all false prophets and to avoid fellowship with heterodox churches or sects. Rom. 16:17.18," The Lutheran Church, the True Visible Church, Thesis XXI C: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church rejects all fraternal and churchly fellowship with those who reject its confession in whole or in part. Rom. 16:17."

Dr. H.C.Schwan, Presidential Address to the Central District, 1867: "Accordingly, unity of faith is an absolutely indispensable prerequisite for church fellowship. Where they do not even earnestly desire this, there certainly the words apply, Avoid them." He spoke in days when the question of joining the General Council lay before Missouri.

Dr. W. Sihler, Denkschrift, 1871, p. 16, presenting reasons why the synods organizing the Synodical Conference could not join hands with existent groups: "In these and similar passages of Holy Writ (Rom. 16:17; Tit. 3:10) we have before us the express and earnest command of God not to remain in church-fraternal fellowship with false teachers and heretical persons." He applied this also to the newly-formed General Council.

Dr. G. Stoeckhardt, Commentary on Romans, ad loc.: "Here, then, stands God's command that Christians shall shun not only false doctrine, but also false teachers and keep themselves apart from such religious societies as tolerate error and errorists. All unionism, which joins truth with error in the same ecclesiastical organism, is condemned by this word of the apostle - and that is God's Word."

Dr. F. Bente's presentation of the passage in like fashion in Lehre und Wehre in the first years of this century is very well-known.

Dr. A. L. Graebner, Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, sec. 128: "In His spiritual kingdom of grace Christ, the only Head of His Church, rules His spiritual subjects jointly and severally by His Word, which alone in the Church is the law of the realm demanding unconditional obedience,... Rom. 16:17,"

Dr. F. Pieper adduces the passage over two dozen times in his Christliche Dogmatik in such fashion: I,35: "Wie die Schrift oft und ernst vor der Abweichung

von der Lehre der Apostel, die Christi eigene Lehre ist, warnt (Roem. 16:17), so weist sie auch reichlich auf die Beweggründe fuer dieses Tun hin. In allgemeiner Bezeichnung nennt sie als Beweggrund das eigene Interesse. Roem. 16:18." 1,55: "Wohl ater ist der Kirche Befohlen, die falschen Lehrer nicht in der Kirche zu dulden, sondern sie mit Gottes Wort zu bekaempfen. Die gebotene Bekaempfung mit Gottes Wort schliesst in sich, die falschen Lehrer als solche, naemlich als solche, die vom Apostelwort abweichen, zu erkennen (Boem. 16:17), sie zu widerlegen (Tit. 1: 9.11), sie zu isolieren, das ist, mit ihnen keine kirchliche Gemeinschaft zu halten (Roem. 16:17; 2 Joh. 10), und sie eventuell, wenn sie nicht selbst kirchenfluechtig werden, von der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft foermlich auszuschliessen." I,99: "Jede Abweichung von Christi Word, das die Kirche im Wort seiner Apostel hat, wird ausdruecklich als ein Aergernis-bezeichnet (Roem. 16:17)."

Thus also in his essay on Unionism, 1924, he wrote: "A third objection that needs to answered, because it is closely related to the former is: We ought to remember that there are Christians in the other churches. Most assuredly we do acknowledge all men who confess that they are damnable sinners and who believe in Christ as the only Savior from sin as fellow-members of the Christian Church. The same Spirit of God who kindled faith in Christ in our hearts has performed this wonderful work in those Christians who are found in heterodox churches. But in their case it is a matter of weakness in knowledge, and it is contrary to God's Word and will that they who are Christians maintain fellowship with the Roman Catholic or with sectarian churches. In other words, they are in the wrong camp. What they ought to do is to leave those churches which mutilate the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ, or dream of a revelation of God's grace without the means of grace. Oh, that all Christians would take to heart the admonition of St. Paul, Rom. 16:17."

Dr. L. Wessel, Proof Texts of the Catechism, p. 258: "In the light of this passage judge of the union services as practised by various denominations. Observe, too, how strongly it condemns pulpit-fellowship and altar-fellow ship with errorists. It pains us, it is true, to keep aloof from all other denominations, but here is the command of God: 'Avoid them.' This command is clear; we cannot refuse obedience to God."

Dr. P.E. Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, N.T., Vol. II: "Paul distinctly tells the Roman Christians and the true believers of all times that they are not only to reject the false doctrine, but also to avoid the false teachers of every kind and degree. It is the express will of God that Christians and Christian organizations with sound Biblical basis must separate themselves, and remain separate, from all denominations in which false doctrine and false teachers are permitted."

In a letter of April 30, 1946, to the clergy of Synod, Pres. J.W. Behnken, reporting on a meeting with Chicago Statement signers, wrote: "At this meeting we voiced our disagreement with some of the points in A Statement as well as with the accompanying letter and insisted that these be corrected or withdrawn." In the organizing meeting with the committee he appointed to meet with the Statement signers the President pointed specifically to the treatment of Rom. 16:17 in A Statement as one of the points to "be corrected or withdrawn."

Dr. Th. Engelder, Notes on Unionism, p. 2: "Scripture explicitly forbids religious unionism in that it requires us to avoid those who teach and uphold the pure doctrine and to avoid all churches and organizations that teach and uphold false doctrine. Sod will have nothing but His pure Word preached in the Church. Jer. 23: 28-32* John 8:31f. He does not sanction false doctrine, but commands all men to shun it. Rom. 16:17."

Dr. Th. Laetsch, Concordia Theological Monthly, VI,9: "The apostle therefore has in mind only such outspoken, anti-Christian errorists as openly and flatly deny every fundamental truth of Christianity, He does not say, Avoid such as subvert completely the Christian truth or as at least deny some of the basic doctrines of the

Bible. He warns us against such as cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned. Contrary to, para, properly beside, alongside of, side by side with; hence these teachers may still be, professing and teaching parts of the Christian doctrine. But side by side with this doctrine they make dissensions and thus cause offenses."

Dr. J.H.C. Fritz, Pastoral Theology, p.218: "Since religious unionism is forbidden by all those Scripture-passagos in which the Lord warns against false doctrine and false teachers, Matt. 7:15; 16,6; Rom. 16,17.18....a pastor and his congregation should not take part in unionistic religious movements of any kind, unionistic church services, unionistic church-work, and the like." Again, in This Church of Ours, 1947: "God tells us to avoid them that cause divisions and offenses contrary to the revealed doctrine of the Word of God, Rom. 16:17. The reverence which we ought to have toward God should prevent us from falsifying His Word or fellowshiping those who do."

Dr. J.T. Mueller, Christian Dogmatics, p. 559: "' hat has just been said should not lead anyone to regard religious unionism (syncretism, Unionismus, Religionsmengerei) as permissible, much less as laudable. The words "with charity toward all" apply indeed to all men, for Christians are commanded to love all men, Matt. 22:39; 5:44; 1 John 3:17.18; but they do not mean that Christians should countenance false prophets and their errors, Matt. 7:15; Gal. 1:8.9. The direction of Scripture with regard to this point is clear and emphatic, Rom. 16:17, etc."

Dr. L.W. Spitz in The Abiding Word, Vol. I, p. 286: "God's command simply says: 'Avoid them' (Rom. 16:17). It is not a charitable act to confirm anyone in error by apparently ignoring it; but this is done when churches join in ecclesiastical functions without first eliminating offensive doctrinal errors, or when an individual joins a heterodox church in public worship."

Dr. F.W. Mayer, American Churches, p.52: "Scripture admonishes us to have visible fellowship only with those who are agreed with us in doctrine (1 Cor. 1:10) and to avoid those who teach errors (Rom. 16:17; 1 Tim. 6:3ff.). By refusing to have fellowship with errorists who still believe in Jesus, we do not destroy the spiritual unity; we do not thereby deny that they are Christians. By not worshiping with an errorist we condemn only his errors. And that is our duty, because God's Word has condemned them."

Prof. W. A. Baepler in The Abiding Word, Vol. II, pp. 509-511: "It is the duty of every Christian, to avoid error and fellowship with errorists.... But the Scriptures actually forbid spiritual association with those who depart from the truth. Rom.. 16:17 we read:..... To fellowship with such as do not agree with us in doctrine is called unionism. And we repudiate unionism, that is, joint church work or worship with adherents of unorthodox church bodies, because thereby the truth is either denied or the appearance of denial or at least of indifferentism is given in disobedience to God's command, as causing divisions in the Church (Rom. 16:17; 2 John 9:10) and as involving the constant danger of losing the Word of God entirely."

Dr. Th. Graebner, mimeographed class notes (1938-39) on Romans 16:17: "The apostle Paul, we may assume, left the words in this general form because he wished to issue a warning which would be comprehensive enough to include false teachers of every kind." In The Merger, a reprint of 1918 Lutheran Witness articles on the formation of the United Lutheran Church, p. 7: "What we complain of with regard to all the bodies mentioned above is, that the Christians in those bodies permit those with whom they are united to teach false doctrine and to practise contrary to the Scriptures. We cannot pick out the good Christians in those bodies and say: With you we shall fellowship. Why not? Because, 1) We cannot read the hearts. We cannot tell which of the Masons in the General Synod and General Council or in the Reformed churches believe in Jesus Christ, and how many believe in the god of the lodge and hope to be saved by good works, by living 'on the level and by the square.' 2) Even

if we could find the true Christians, we would have to tell them; By permitting errorists to speak in your church and for your church, and by supporting and taking part in unchristian practises, you sin against the Word of God, which forbids such alliance with error. Rom. 16,17." He quotes the Theol. Quarterly on p. 20: "It is the duty of every Christian to keep aloof from, and avoid, all fellowship and cooperation with heterodox churches. If there be those who will not continue in Christ's Word, and refuse to teach and observe what Christ has commanded us, their fellowship must not be sought, but avoided."

Discussing unionism in the Homiletic Magazine, XLIV,566f., Dr. Graebner wrote: "Our basis for this position is the doctrine of Holy Scripture regarding the clearness of the Bible as a book of revealed truth. Those who take any other stand must assume either that God could not or did not desire to speak so plainly that men may understand what was in His mind and what He intended to reveal to them. Either would be blasphemy. **We** have the direct command to 'remain in His truth' and to 'teach men to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded us,' and we have the divine prohibition, Rom. 16:17. Really, this is all there is to the anti-unionistic argument, and I believe it is plenty. It is an all-inclusive principle. Anyone who limits, for instance, the application of the confessional principle only to the Reformed is neither logical in his thinking nor consistent in his practise. If I am permitted, e.g., to conduct jointly a Thanksgiving service with a Lutheran minister whom I hold to be a Christian at heart, though he be identified with a neutral or opposition body of Lutherans, then I must do the same in the case of a Methodist, Baptist or Catholic, whom I hold to be a Christian at heart. Unless I do this, I not only act on a premise which makes of Lutheranism a sect, but I would most uncharitably discriminate against the brethren (we know there are such) among the Reformed and Papists. I can understand a man who is ready for union with any one who calls himself a Christian; but I do not understand how a Lutheran can, in his relation to those who bear the Lutheran name, cast overboard the confessional principle and establish fellowship with those Lutherans whom he 'believes to be Christians at heart,' I hope that it makes no difference to us whether a man in his relation to God is either 'Missourian*' or 'Christian'; or shall we make a sect also of our Missouri Synod? There is only one escape from these dilemmas; that connection which a man publicly holds decides his confessional status, nothing else. If he is a Lutheran at heart, but a brother to errorists, I cannot fellowship him without establishing the rule that it is the invisible faith in the heart which decides Christian fellowship - a rule which would lead to utmost confusion and which would be un-Lutheran and un-Scriptural."

In a meeting of the President's Committee on A Statement with the Chicago Statement's proponents on Sept. 25, 1946, Dr. Graebner moved the adoption of the following declaration, presented by the President's Committee in answer to point 5 of A Statement: "The passage Rom. 16:17.16 is applicable to any and all who persistently teach contrary to Apostolic doctrine and not merely to such as teach faith- subverting errors." However, for the sake of a complete record it must be added that in the Lutheran Witness of Feb. 25, 1947, this footnote appeared: "We incline to the notion, supported by more than 30 commentaries which we have consulted, that Rom. 16:17f. refers to un-Christian enemies of the Church who by deceitful tactics are trying to seduce Christians, undermining and frustrating the Christian message;" and that Dr. Graebner declared to the 1947 convention, after its reaffirmation of the Brief Statement of 1932, that he stands by every word of the Chicago Statement.

Dr. Wm. Arndt wrote in Christian Prayer (1937), p. 65; "Whoever is altering the teachings of Jesus thereby is creating a division in the Church, placing himself in opposition to all who adhere to Christ's doctrine. We have been told by St. Paul that we must avoid such division-makers, Rom. 16,17. That implies of course that we do not have Prayer-fellowship with them. This same admonition holds with respect to those who are not the originators but the perpetuators of the divisions, carrying on the work of the captains of strife, discord, and disharmony by teaching the same errors as these men. A number of generations have passed between Roger Williams

who was one of the first to teach Baptist principles in what we now call the United States, and a present-day adherent of such principles, and the latter may be as peaceful and gentle a member of our race as you care to meet; still by perpetuating the false teachings of Roger Williams, he is helping to continue the division which these teachings have caused among those that bear the Christian name, and one cannot see how such a one can prove that we do not have to apply Romans 16,17 against him and say to him that, as long as he maintains such divisive principles, he is placing a barrier between himself and us, obstructing prayer-fellowship."

Again, to complete the record it must be added that when these words came under discussion in the meeting of the President's Committee with the Statement signers in November 1946 Dr. Arndt stated with regard to Rom. 16:17-18: "I have changed my position."

In May 1941 the faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, rendered an opinion on Prayer-fellowship in which we read: "Prayer-fellowship with those of a heterodox faith is forbidden in Scripture. All texts in which we are admonished to keep the doctrine pure, as Josh. 1:7,8; John 8:31,32; Gal. 1:8,9; Titus 1:9, and all texts in which we are warned against false teachers and their false doctrines, as Jer. 23: 31,32; Matt. 7:15; Rom. 16:17; Col. 1:8, 20-22; 2 Tim. 4:2-4; 1 John 4:1, forbid pulpit-fellowship, altar-fellowship, and Prayer-fellowship with the heterodox."

The faculty of Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, in a letter of Oct. 26, 1945, expressing disapprobation of A Statement to the chairman of the signers' group, objected: "Moreover, one of the chief texts which forbid all unionism, including prayer fellowship, with heterodox teachers (not all heterodox Christians), Rom, 16: 17,18, you presume to eliminate as applicable to all heterodox teachers."

The Synodical Catechism, Qu. 186, asserts: "We use the doctrine of the Church properly... D. When we avoid all false churches and all other organizations that profess a religion that is false.... Rom. 16:17;" also, Q,u. 326: "The Lord's Supper must be denied D. To those of a different faith, since the Lord's Supper is a testimony of the unity of faith... Rom. 16:17."

Know the Truth, a manual for adult instruction prepared by Pastors A. Doerffler and W. H. Eifert for the Literature Board of Synod, teaches, p. 17: "Our obligations to a true Christian congregation:2. To avoid congregations which teach doctrines contrary to the Word of God. Rom. 16:17."

Concordia Cyclopedia, edited by Drs. Fuerbringer, Engelder, Kretzmann, p.774; "The indifferent and pacifist stand of the unionist is condemned in all those texts which bid us beware of false prophets and to be separate from those who deny the truth. Titus 1,13,14; 1 Tim* 2,12; 6,14; 2 Tim, 3,5; 6,3-5; Matt. 7,15; Jer. 23,28; Acts 20,29; Rom. 16,17; 1 John 4,1; 2 John 10.11."

Drs. Engelder, Graebner, Arndt, Mayer wrote in Popular Symbolics, sec. 145: "All Christians are bound to adhere only to such churches and organizations that teach the pure doctrine and to avoid all churches and organisations that teach and uphold false doctrine. God will have nothing but His pure Word preached in the Church. Jer. 23:28-32; John 8:31f. He does not sanction false doctrine, but commands all men to shun it. Rom. 16:17."

It is patent that, with the exception of the novel position recently espoused by the signers of the Chicago Statement of 1946, there has been in the public teaching of our Synod throughout its history a consensus on Romans 16:17,18. That agreement was reemphasized by the resolution of the 1947 convention "That our Synod again declare that the Brief Statement correctly expresses its doctrinal position." That resolution, accepted without dissenting vote, included adoption of the words of section 28: "All Christians are required by God to discriminate between orthodox

and heterodox church-bodies, Matt. 7,15, to have fellowship only with orthodox church-bodies, and, in case they have strayed into heterodox church-bodies, to leave them, Rom. 16, 17. We repudiate unionism, that is, church-fellowship with the adherents of false doctrine, as disobedience to God's command, as causing divisions in the Church, Rom. 16,17; 2 John 9,10, and as involving the constant danger of losing the Word of God entirely, 2 Tim. 2,17-21." The grave declarations therein made are most certainly not based on a passage that is an "exegetical problem." Missouri has not been in the habit of functioning in such fashion.

Let us recall Dr. Pieper's words (Chr. Dogm., III, 487f.): "A church body does not lose its orthodox character by the casual intrusion of errors. What the apostle Paul declared to the elders of Ephesus: 'Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them,' was not only experienced, by the apostolic church, but was true in the church of the Reformation, and will be true in the church to the Last Day. Then does a church first forfeit the name "orthodox" when it no longer acts according to Rom. 16:17, that is, does not reprove and finally reject the error that has arisen, but lets it go on unchecked and thus, in reality, grants it equal rights with the truth."

III

CONCLUSIONS

1. Romans 16:17-18 is a clear passage and is, as such, correctly cited in our Confessions and in the Brief Statement, section 28.

2. The passage is applicable al30 in our times and is given by our Lord to be applied today.

3. The passage is applicable to any and all who persistently teach contrary to apostolic doctrine and their adherents, and not merely to such as teach faith-subverting errors.

4. Therefore the passage forbids church fellowship with any heterodox church body and those who support it.

5. Therefore the passage regulates our conduct also toward such Lutheran churches in America, and their members, as teach and adhere to false doctrine.

6. The passage applies also to the practise of public joint prayer.

7. Fellowship must be denied to those who refuse to skopein, i.e., to be on guard against false teachers.

8. Fellowship must be denied to those who after due admonition refuse to ekklinete, i.e., to "avoid them," when division- and scandal-makers carry on their work of making divisions in a church body.

February 3, 1948

A limited number of extra copies of this paper are available at 15 cents a copy. Address H. W. Romoser, 233 N. Cuyler Ave., Oak Park, 111.